

ENGLAND
SINCE
GLORIOUS REVOLUTION
(1688—1914)

BY
O.P. SINGH
M.A.

**Author of the famous Historical Pamphlet Series
on Hindu Period, Delhi Sultanate, Mughal
Period, India upto 1526 and India under
the Mussalmans.**

VOLUME I

VIJ & RAMA

NAI SARAK — DELHI.

1954

Price : Rs. 7/-

Published by :
L. Pars Ram Vij
Proprietor,
Vij & Rama.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

First Edition 1954.

Printed by :
Kohli Printing Agency, at
The Movies Press, Delhi.

PREFACE

The principal purpose of ~~this~~ book is to answer the requirements of the students of the Indian Universities. In this book, I believe, I have gone further than has hitherto been attempted in any book on the subject. It may perhaps be said that there is already a superabundance of History books in the market. Many of these books, though excellent in their way and day, fall far short of the needs of modern examinations. The subject has ceased to be sordid presentation of meaningless dates and facts, to be learnt parrot-wise and reproduced when required. History is neither a reporter's job nor is it built on a thread of personalities. Politics in England are, by and large, more concerned with mass continental movements than individuals—despite the glamour of the individuals—and in this book the reader will find a considerably closer balance between politics, economics, ethics and personality. I have 'looked in' intensively as well as extensively and have endeavoured not to by-pass any current. The result is the presentation of this closely written and intimately detailed and comprehensive volume.

It is hoped, therefore, that lecturers and students alike shall find in this book a topic-wise discussion of each historical event and covering everything that is necessary for a study of a high order. The book is written in simple, homely, lucid English and actually every attempt has been made to eliminate superfluous details. The greatest stress has been laid on a methodical elaboration of the matter so that the reader may easily pick up and reproduce each inter-linked chain of events.

The facts upon which this book has been based have been obtained mainly from Adams', Edwards', C. Grant

Robertson's, Munro's, Marriot's, Sterling Taylor's, Trevelyn's Keir's, Green's, William Hunt's and Temperley's works. The writer has been immensely helped in the clothing of these dry bones by his personal experience of over three years as a lecturer on the subject for degree classes. The main plan has been to group together for convenience such portions of the subject as are closely allied and to follow a chronological exposition and development by resorting to needful subdivision. Thus the book becomes equally serviceable for all learners. So a course has been laid down, which may be followed without deviation from beginning to end; and I believe that the method I have adopted will give all the least trouble in finding what they want. I have endeavoured to keep the work within a reasonable compass and to provide amply for the needs of candidates preparing for the higher examinations.

Grateful acknowledgment is given to Mr. Ajit Singh Bhatia M. A. for assistance at stages in the preparation of the book; and for his valuable contribution of Chapters 2, 13 and 15.

*186, Rouse Avenue,
New Delhi
18th June, 1954.*

O. P. SINGH

I dedicate this little effort of mine to you—
The Departed Souls—because it is your
memory—my only treasure—that
inspires and encourages me to
ply this life's ship in the
onrushing onslaughts of
world's stormy
ocean !

CONTENTS

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Revolutionary Settlement in England ..	1
(a) Bill of Rights ..	3
(b) Mutiny Act ..	4
(c) Triennial Act ..	5
(d) Toleration Act ..	5
(e) Significance and importance of Revolution ..	7
II. Evolution of Cabinet in England ..	10
III. Jacobite Risings ..	22
(a) Rising of 1715 ..	22
(b) Rising of 1745 ..	24
IV. Struggles of the 18th Century ..	27
(a) The war of the Spanish Succession ..	27
(b) The war of the Austrian Succession ..	30
(c) Seven Years war ..	31
V. Whig Oligarchy ..	36
VI. George III's Personal Rule ..	42
VII. American War of Independence ..	52
(a) Causes of the war ..	53
(b) Events of the war ..	59
(c) Treaty of versailles ..	61
(d) Results and significance ..	61
(e) Causes of English defeat ..	62
VIII. Irish Question in the 18th Century ..	64
(a) Political, Religious and Economic grievances ..	65

(b) Movement for Independence	...	67
(c) Union Act of 1800	...	69
IX. Outstanding Personalities of the 18th Century England.	...	71
(a) Duke of Marlborough	...	71
✓(b) Sir Robert Walpole	...	73
✓(c) Pitt the Elder	...	81
(d) Pitt the Younger	...	86
X. Importance of English Sea power in the 18th Century	...	95
XI. The French Revolution	...	99
(a) Causes	...	100
(b) Teachings of Montesquieu, Voltaire and Rousseau.	...	104
(c) Fall of Bastille	...	109
(d) Results of the French Revolution	...	114
(e) Napoléon Bonaparte	...	115
(f) The Battle of the Nile	...	126
(g) Battle of Trafalgar	...	128
(h) Battle of Austerlitz	...	130
(i) Continental System	...	131
(j) Peninsular war	...	133
(k) Battle of waterloo	...	139
(l) French Revolution and England	...	141
XII. Growth of British Rule in India upto 1857	...	150
(a) Hawkins visit to the Mughal Court	...	150
(b) Sir Thomas Roe in India	...	151
(c) Three Carnatic wars	...	153

(d) Siraj-ul-Daula	...	153
(e) Black Hole Tragedy	...	154
(f) Battle of Plassey	...	155
(g) Mir Jafar	...	155
(h) Mir Kasim	...	156
(i) Battle of Buxar	...	157
(j) Warren Hastings	...	158
(k) Lord Cornwallis	...	158
(l) Lord Wellesley	...	159
(m) Lord Hastings	...	161
(n) Lord William Bentinck	...	162
(o) Lord Dalhousie	...	163
(p) Lord Canning	...	163

XIII. Agrarian Revolution in England ... 166

(a) The Nature of Advance	...	166
(b) Features of Manorial System	...	167
(c) Uses and the drawbacks of Manorial System		168
(d) Disappearance of the Manorial System	...	169
(e) The Revolution	...	1 6
(f) Enclosure Movement	...	171
(g) Corn laws and the Agricultural Distress	...	174

XIV. The Eastern Question ... 178

(a) Greek Independence	...	180
(b) Egyptian Question	...	182
(c) Crimean War	...	186
(d) Liberation of Balkan States	...	193
(e) Treaty of San Stefano	...	198
(f) Congress of Berlin	...	201

XV. Industrial Revolution in England	... 209
(a) Before Industrial Revolution	... 211
(b) England (1696)	... 213
(c) Inventions	... 215
(d) Stages of Industrial Revolution	... 219
(e) Results of the Revolution	... 224
XVI. Parliamentary Reforms	... 236
(a) Reform Act of 1832	... 236
(b) Reform Act of 1867	... 241
(c) Reform Act of 1884	... 247
(d) Reform Act of 1911	... 249
(e) Acts of 1918 and 1928	... 251
XVII. Outstanding Personalities of the 19th Century England	... 253
(a) Lord Castlereagh	... 253
(b) Lord Canning	... 256
(c) The Duke of Wellington	... 258
(d) Sir Robert Peel	... 260
(e) Palmerston	... 262
(f) Benjamin Disraeli	... 266
(g) Gladstone	... 272
XVIII. India under the crown	... 291
(a) Declaration of 1858	... 292
(b) Agricultural Reforms	... 294
(c) Reforms in the Health Departments	... 295
(d) Reforms in Educational System	... 296
(e) National Movement	... 297
(f) Foreign Policy	... 304
XIX. Irish Question During the Nineteenth Century	... 310
XX. Causes of the 1st World War	... 323
Punjab University Papers	... 339

INTRODUCTION

For full two centuries England was ruled with a rough rod. The basic assumptions on which Henry VII laid the foundations of monarchy in 1485, remained in vogue till 1688. Parliament remained subservient to the Tudors. But an inquisitive eye could detect the shadow of coming events from the question of monopolies during the reign of wily Elizabeth. Moreover, with the defeat of Spanish Armada in 1588, the fear of external aggression receded and the mind of the people was diverted to setting their internal political institutions on some other equations, which could be more democratic in profession as well as in practice.

Stuarts did not know how to play cricket. They tried to hit out blindly, because of their lack of acute observation of the political trends or might be, because of their lack of a will-for-settlement. They tried to under-rate the importance of an irresistible onrushing power—the power of the Parliament—and had to pay the price of this fatal mistake with their blood. The Bourbonic-instinct of neither learning nor unlearning from the vital events of the history, proved suicidal for them; it guillotined their dynasty, sent one king to the gallows and another had to take refuge in a foreign country. The coup de grace was accorded during the reign of James II.

The year 1688 represents the ushering in of a new term of equation between the king and the Parliament. Divine Right of kingship evaporated from the political scene of England. King-in-Parliament, and not the king was to rule the British people now onwards.

The volcano of self-assertion had erupted and set ablaze the old order of social relationships. From the ashes of this blaze came out a society which laid deep the foundations for newer values in economic relationships. Only once

again in the British history did the monarchy—as represented by George III—try to stifle the power of Parliament but its efforts proved infructuous and it had to surrender unconditionally.

During this period of history *i.e.* 1688 to 1914, there were many world-shaking events. There was a revolution in the political order; a similar type of upheaval in the social order and a long movement for the reform in the Church and in the economic order of the society. The American Revolution opened the eyes of England and made her in future to be considerate in her attitude towards her colonies. That the Yoke of imperialism cannot be perpetrated on the throats of slave countries—was proved once for all. Colonies are like **ripe** fruits which must fall off the tree sooner or later.

The British policy of maintaining balance of power on the continent was tested and found fit during the Revolutionary wars with France. But for the valour of some of her outstanding soldiers on land and sea, England would be more than once under the impending danger of being swallowed by Napoleonic arms.

After the Waterloo, history of England tilted towards more emphasis on the transference of democracy from the feudal aristocracy to the industrial aristocracy. Industrial proletariat fought shoulder to shoulder with the industrial aristocracy to extricate the power from feudalists. The Reform Act of 1832 was the result of this compromise. Now onwards the fight lay between industrial aristocracy, trying to preserve its newly gained power, and the industrial proletariat, trying to improve its economic lot by gaining political power.

As for the foreign policy of England during the period, it can be easily divided in three parts. The first part had a long record of rivalry with France over the foreign possessions. Both the nations wanted to win the race

and were always obstructing each other in their expansion towards the East, West and the South. The war of Spanish Succession, the war of Austrian Succession and the Seven Years War saw the two nations flying at the throats of each other. The English came out successful from this unnerving war of attrition. There was then a setback in the loss of the American colonies. England was again seen in death grip with the French over the wars of principles *i.e.* Revolutionary wars.

With the success of the British arms in the fields of Waterloo the foreign policy of England underwent a complete change. Castlereagh, the foreign minister, believed in a peaceful settlement of the European problems. Canning, his successor, no doubt sympathised with the European democratic movements but he never ran the risk of entangling England in these knotty problems. Palmerston, his disciple believed in a policy of 'Bluffing'. Although Disraeli was an imperialist yet his mettle was never tested to its full extent. The policy of Gladstone and his successors has been termed as 'Splendid Isolation policy'. England, mostly speaking, did not actively interfere in the European problems, unless her own vested interests were at stake.

The last phase was a phase of active participation in the European problems and of concluding alliances with them. France, the traditional enemy was reconciled. In 1902 a defensive alliance was concluded with Japan. A settlement with even Russia was arrived at, owing to the growing danger of Germany. This conspiring policy divided the whole of Europe into two armed camps. The murder of the Arch Duke of Austria worked as a spark for the smouldering fire and the whole of the human race was entangled in a world war in 1914.

CHAPTER I

REVOLUTIONARY SETTLEMENT IN ENGLAND

The hostile attitude of James II towards his people, and not the events of the reign of Charles II, accentuated the forces which ultimately connived to bring about the Glorious Revolution. In spite of James II's being a Roman Catholic there was universal joy in the country at the time of his succession. No doubt majority of the people were hostile to Roman Catholicism, yet they had in no way any idea of dethroning James II. This is quite apparent from the support which James II got from his people at the time of the Monmouth rebellion. Rather than appreciating the services of his people, James II suspected them and kept on supporting the Roman Catholic cause, (which was a dead cause in England) completely forgetting the consequences which his father had had to bear. He tried to remove all sorts of restrictions from the Roman Catholics. This was an act of fanning the smouldering fire rather than that of pouring oil on troubled waters. The people had been bearing patiently all the perverse and unjustified acts of the old, staggering and issueless King. The dormant volcano of their self assertion erupted with the birth of a son. Thinking that the son of a Catholic King is bound to be a Catholic, they immediately asked for the help of William III of Holland. Even the Tories, who during the days of Charles II were the staunch supporters of the Crown, joined hands with the Whigs. And thus making a common cause, they invited William to England to save them from the tyrannical rule of James II. William III might have refused the offer, had James II agreed to help him against the ruler of France—his life—long enemy. William III in fact wanted to utilize the resources of England in war against France. As long as James II was at the helm of English affairs there could be no hope of any help from England; William III, therefore, accepted their invitation and landed in England with his forces. He

was given a rousing reception by the people of all the parties. James II, who had been betrayed by his commander-in-chief and even his own daughter, fled from England in a desperate mood and never got a chance to see it again in his life.

The event was given the name of "The Glorious Revolution" by the English people because of its two distinctive features. In the first place, it was accomplished without any blood-shed. Secondly, it was the triumph of the Parliament over the Crown in so far as it evicted one King and handed over the throne to another one. Macaulay maintains that the Glorious Revolution was political rather than a religious revolution. James II was dethroned, not because he was a Roman Catholic but, because he believed in the absolute powers of the King which according to him, had been bestowed upon him by the Almighty God.

The revolution marked a new era in the history of England. It once for all decided that it was not the King but the Parliament which was the supreme power in the country. It also made it clear that the ruling power had been given to the King not by the Almighty God but by the Parliament. The judges, who upto that time were considered to be 'lions under the Crown' and whose tenure depended upon the King's pleasure, were no more the servants of the Crown. They now came under the control of the Parliament and were to remain in the office during their good behaviour. The foreign policy of England also underwent a great change. The Revolution brought William III at the helm of English affairs. The period of his rule was devoted to a constant struggle against France. The forces of Holland alone, were fighting against the armed might of France before the Revolution. But now folded as they were, with the English might, they were strong enough to snub the aggressive tendencies of the French King.

James II, deserted by all his sympathisers, fled to France

in 1689. The Convention which had invited William III, declared that as James II had abdicated and, as the throne had fallen vacant, it was being offered to William III and Mary jointly. The Convention became a regular parliament. It began to enact legislation which made it difficult for the future English King to repeat the story of the days of James II. The Declaration of Rights was issued which was later on given the name of the **Bill of Rights**. The Declaration denounced the worst acts of James II and made the suspending and dispensing powers illegal. The Acts which were instruments in the hands of the Crown for wielding its authority were abolished. The imposition of taxes without the consent of the Parliament was declared illegal. In future the King could in no way collect money from his people. Nor could he maintain any standing army in the days of peace. At several previous occasions the King had interfered in the elections of the Parliament. Now the Declaration stated that there would be a free election to the Parliament. The members of the Parliament were also given freedom of speech. It was by virtue of the existence of this clause that Wilkes claimed the right of freedom of speech as a member of the Parliament and thus saved himself from the wrath of George III. The Court of High Commission and other such courts as had proved to be instruments of tyranny under James II were abolished. The Bill of Rights further stated that there would be frequent meetings of the Parliament. According to another clause of the Bill, it was declared that in future no Roman Catholic or a person married to a Roman Catholic could become the King of England. The Crown was heretofore, stripped of all his inherent powers though the King was still to sit on the same diamond throne !

The Bill of Rights has been proclaimed to be the Third Charter of English liberties. A close analysis of the Bill would, however, reveal that it was by no means a daring step on the part of the Parliament. Its importance has, as a matter of fact, been unduly exaggerated by modern authors. The Bill had, nothing new or special in it. It was meant only to redress the past grievances

of the Parliament. Little wonder, Hall has dubbed the Bill as a negative document.

The significance of the Bill of Rights lies in the fact that it paved the way for the future constitutional progress of England by asserting the supremacy of the Parliament. The Parliament was now given a greater share in the administration of the country. The Convention Parliament continued its work of settlement and made an all-out effort to reduce the powers of the Crown to the minimum. It passed many new Bills, **The Mutiny Act** being one of them. The work of subjugation of the English territories had been completed by the Dutch soldiers who had accompanied William III from Holland. William discriminated against the English soldiers and reposed greater confidence in the Dutch forces. The English now realised the difference between a national and a foreign King. This caused great unrest amongst the English soldiers. They turned against their generals who had deceived James II. When the King and the Parliament came to know of this unrest amongst the English soldiers they, fore-seeing the consequences, passed the **Mutiny Act**. Their rising was put down before hand and many of their leaders were transported to Holland. As most of the soldiers till then were just like civilians, they were, henceforth, to be ruled by a strict rod of military discipline. In future all the soldiers who disobeyed the Government were to be tried by court martial.

The Parliament had not forgotten that the chief power of James II had been the standing army which he had maintained and stationed outside the city of London during peace time. In order to secure its position the Parliament, by another clause of the Mutiny Act, declared that the King in future was not to maintain any standing army in peace time. For the maintenance of the army, the king was to get the Parliaments' sanction every year. It thus made safe the meeting of the Parliament every year, if the King was to have an army.

In 1694 the **Triennial Act** was passed by the Parliament by which the tenure of the Parliament was fixed at three years, after which new elections were to be held. The Parliament could in no way usurp the powers in the future for more than the specified period, as had been done in the past by the Long Parliament and the Convention Parliament.

During the year 1689, the Government declared that all the officials of the State and church should take an oath of fidelity and loyalty to the Government. Many of the Bishops, clergies and other officials of the State refused to take the oath. They considered William III to be an usurper and were not prepared to take an oath of loyalty to him. They were deprived of all their dignity. But in spite of that, the clergies could not be cowed down. They remained hostile to the church policy of the King. Believing in the Divine Rights of Kings and considering the Stuarts as the legitimate sovereigns, they went on helping them in their struggles for restoration. Their case was, however, hopeless.

The non-confirmists, no doubt, had been offered concessions by James II side by side with the Roman Catholics but they had refused to get these privileges and had fully supported the cause of William III. He realising their valuable services, tried to remove some of their restrictions and thus got the **Toleration Act** passed by the Parliament during the year 1689. By this Act it was declared that the people who would acknowledge William III as the supreme head of their church and give a declaration against the authority of Pope saying that they considered the King and not the Pope as the head of their church, would be allowed to be taken in the Government service. Many non-confirmists after taking this oath of loyalty to the King resumed their duties. The Roman Catholics were also expected to take this oath of loyalty. They did not do it and so they after the passing of this Bill remained out of the Government jobs and the

restrictions for them remained as before. It was only in the nineteenth century, that the restrictions from all the sections of the people were removed by the Emancipation Act.

One of the chief causes of conflict between the Crown and the Parliament was the **financial question**. The Kings were not in a position to collect sufficient money for their maintenance so they had to look for the consent of the Parliament for the money. Since the 1st day of the accession of Charles I, the Parliament refused to vote any supply to the King. It clearly informed him that until and unless he ruled without the consent of the Parliament no supply would be sanctioned to him. Another thing which the Parliament emphasised was that in case of Parliament's sanction, the Kings were to utilise those supplies only as and when it was deemed by the Parliament as fit and justified.

It was the year 1665 when Charles II, the most subordinate King to the Parliament was granted supplies on the conditions that he would use them as considered proper by the Parliament. Since the Whigs were in power the King in no way could spend any amount for the maintenance of the army for which an early sanction from the Parliament was necessary. Previously the King had been allowed by the Parliament to collect some amount by means of some of his hereditary taxes like that of crown land and feudal dues. By the new settlement a fixed amount of £1200,000 per year was fixed for the expenses of the crown in times of peace. He was also allowed to collect some more taxes for the increase of his income and also was paid by the Parliament in times of war some more amount provided the war was justified and had been declared by its consent. The settlement greatly increased on the whole the hold of the Parliament over the Crown.

Significance and Importance of Revolution.

It was really a good luck of England that she accomplished such a big task without any blood-shed. It seemed from the struggle that began during the days of James I for supremacy between the King and the Parliament, that it would end with a great loss of life on both the sides. The same thing was expected at the time when neither of the two parties was ready to come down during the days of James II and it was visibly feared that there would be a great blood-shed on the very day, the sides came down to test their strength. The opposite principles no doubt jumped in the arena but one side left it without striking a blow and the field was captured completely against its expectation by the other party. It was the victory of the Parliament over the Crown and great task which was accomplished without shedding a single drop of blood was named the Glorious Revolution. It was for the accomplishment of this very task that France had to sacrifice many thousands lives and still the work remained incomplete. Russia accomplished it but in no way without blood-shed. There is no revolution in the history of the world which was brought to an end in such splendid way. It sounded, the death knell of the despotic powers of the King and it cleared the misunderstanding from the minds of that Despot Ruler James II that the throne was given to him not by God but by the people. From that day onward no English King has boasted for the Divine Theory and their lies the importance of the revolution. According to Trevelyan it was a settlement by consent and compromise. According to some historians, even the term Revolution used for this is not correct, because it did not bring about any big change in the administration of Government in England. It had got no daring article and the items of settlement were nothing more than the grievances which the Parliament had since long nursed.

There was nothing new in the clauses of the settlement. Some patriotic scholars of England are of the opinion that

the revolution was not a glorious one as it turned the free English people into slaves. No doubt they had a King who did not care for their individual rights but atleast he was their national King. As a result of the revolution, no doubt the power of the English Parliament increased but it came under the foreign domination, *i.e.*, domination of Holland. The English people having no interest in the European struggles were dragged in a war against France which was purely for the personal benefits of Holland. Secondly to liberate England from its own national King and national forces by means of help of a foreign King and foreign forces was not a glorious accomplishment. Majority of the people did not take any interest in the political affairs of the country and they never bothered to know as to by whom they were being ruled, the King or the Parliament. The replacement of a national ruler by a foreigner one came to them as a surprise. It was surely an unglorious act that they witnessed. It was all due to the treachery of the Friends of James II that the work was easily accomplished by his opponents. In fact no sacrifice had been made for the freedom of the nation. It was the sacrifice of the honour of Churchill, which was made when he deceived his master. It was also the sacrifice of the love of Anne which she made by leaving her beloved father for accomplishing her ends by joining the opposite party.

In spite of all the draw backs which have been mentioned above, it will be an under-estimation of the event if we ignore it on the basis of the remarks noted above. It was, in fact, a revolution which was supported by the majority of the English population. Had the English nation not been interested in the event then there would have been surely blood-shed between the opposite parties and James II. He would not have been deserted easily. Again had the nation been in favour of the Stuarts then their last two heirs so called Old and Young Pretenders, the English National, would not have failed so miserably when they made attempts during the days of Georges for the regaining of their ancestral throne.

Thus concluding in a nutshell, we can say that it was surely a step towards democracy and after this event the supremacy of the Parliament as well as the common law was never challenged.

Questions

1. Analyse the legal and other changes effected after the Revolution of 1688. (P.U. 1944)

2. The Revolution (1688) was a great event in the struggle by which in Great Britain the King became the servant of the people (Clerk.) Explain and discuss this Statement. (P.U. 1947)

3. Discuss the constitutional importance of the Bill of Rights. (P.U. 1949)

CHAPTER II

EVOLUTION OF CABINET IN ENGLAND

"The British Cabinet is the most curious formation in the political world of modern times"¹. It is no doubt the most important single piece of mechanism in the whole structure of British Government. It "lives and acts simply by understanding without a single line of written law or constitution to determine its relations to the monarch or to parliament, or to the nation; or the relations of its members to one another, or to their head."² "The Cabinet is thus a conspicuous instance of the tendency in English history to find practical solutions of difficult constitutional questions without much attention to constitutional theories".³

The modern cabinet is not the Executive, though it is the motive power of the Executive; it is not even the ministry in the strict sense of the term, for it does not include all the ministerial heads of executive departments. It is a group of the Crown's Confidential servants including all the important holders of office. It "is the chief feature of a system, based not on statute law, but on customs, conventions, and convenience, whose *raison d'être* is to harmonise the exercise of the legal prerogatives of the Crown with the broad principle of Ministerial responsibility and with the powers and rights of a representative Legislature"⁴. The second half of the seventeenth and the

1 and 2. Gladstone quoted by Munro in 'the Governments of Europe'.....P. 76.

3. 'Notes on British History' by Edwards.....P. 575.

4. 'England under the Hanoverians' by C. Grant Robertson
...P. 183.

eighteenth century witnessed the gradual piecing together of the features that imply the Cabinet system of Government.

Contemporary evidence establishes the fact that the political world was already familiar with the term "Cabinet" as a "Council of the Crown". "The old Curia Regis of Norman times became the primogeniture of the Privy Council"⁵ which in turn had intimate link with Parliament in so far as its members were also the members of Parliament. In the early fifteenth century it was subjected to Parliament with disastrous results. But in the sixteenth century the Tudors made it an all powerful instrument of their despotic power. Nothing was then exempt from its vigilant supervision. Its members, moreover, were not responsible to Parliament but to King alone. Parliament's rod constituted in impeachment alone, which also could be done away by the decree of pardon granted by the Crown.

The Council—since about the Renaissance in England was showing a tendency to increase in number. With the growth of its membership and the vivisection of the governmental interests into various committees, the Council eventually became so unwieldy that it ceased to be useful as an advisory body. "The rank of Privy Councillor was frequently bestowed by the King as an honorary distinction upon men who rarely or never attended the Council's meetings".⁶ The Council became a club of interminable debates. The King, therefore, began to select a few members of the Council whom he could consult on affairs of State "without long debates and too much publicity" and summon them to his private consultation room, or "Cabinet". The King was not bound to consult the Council nor any particular

5. Munro.....P. 76.

6. Munro.....P. 77.

member of it, on any question of policy. He could, and even did consult members but of the Committees and persons out of the Council.

The exact date when the practice of departmentalisation into Committees originated is not known. The word "Cabinet" is first found in Bacon's essays, but the first definite allusion to this new development is found in Clarendon's account of the year 1640. "Those persons", he writes (meaning Archbishop Laud, Lord Strafford, Lord Cottingen, Lord Northumberland, Bishop Juxon, Sir H. Vane, Sir F. Windebauk, and the two Secretaries of State) "made up the Committee of State, which was reproachfully afterwards called the Junto and enviously then in court the Cabinet Council".⁷ At any rate, in the time of Charles II the cabinet consisted of five members, all of whom were noblemen and close friends of the King.

Charles II being "Pleasure loving and quickwitted" was bored by the never ending debates in the Privy Council. He wanted business expeditiously and with less talk. The Council had become impossibly large for executive business. Accordingly Clarendon suggested the setting up of four Committees among which the work of the administration could be distributed. It is in these four Committees of the Council that the present administrative system may be said to have originated. Besides these four formally recognised Committees there was another informal Committee in which the germ of the present cabinet may be found. Thus Charles superseded the Privy Council and in 1679 delivered the funeral oration over the dead body of the Council. He said, "His Majesty thanks you for all the good advice which you have given him, which might have been more frequent if the great numbers of the Council had not made it unfit for the secrecy and despatch of business.

7. Marriot, 'English Political Institutions'.....P. 70.

This forced him to use a smaller number of you in a foreign Committee, and sometimes the advice of some few among them upon such occasions for many years past".⁸ This oration was the virtual end of the old Council as an executive body.

Cabal was a kind of Commission for foreign affairs, consisting of Clifford (a Roman Catholic, appointed Lord Treasurer), the Earl of Arlington (a Roman Catholic at heart, appointed Secretary of State), the Duke of Buckingham, Lord Ashley (afterwards Earl of Shaftesbury, appointed Chancellor of Exchequer), the Earl of Landerdale (who was governing Scotland). This was done in consonance with the plan laid down by Sir William Temple, tried after the fall of Clarendon, and proved unsuccessful because of the diverging interests of the members. The Cabal cannot be regarded as a modern "Ministry" or "Cabinet" as (a) Cabinet is always informed of King's policy but Cabal never knew about the secret agreement with French Government, (b) It never enjoyed the confidence of the House of Commons; (c) It did not work on the principle of collective responsibility; and (d) Its members were never united in policy. "They", according to Keir, "were personal servants of the King". As a matter of fact the King was still, and for a long time after, the real executive. He chose his own ministers and controlled their policy without getting the Parliament's approval of it.

On its side, "Parliament regarded new methods with some suspicion as evidence of intrigue in King's interest, but it could not enforce its power, except by either confronting King with arms or by old practice of impeachment of King's servants".⁹ The development was attacked as unconstitutional. "Both Whig and Tory critics equally determined to secure ministerial responsibility, saw in the nascent

8 Marriot, English Political Institutions.....P. 74.

9. Adams.....P. 349.

'Cabinet' an innovation which threatened to undermine the recognised position of the legal Privy Council. By changing the Onus of responsibility, ascertainable and enforceable by process of law, to an undefined responsibility of an undefined group incapable of legal proof, the constitutional party felt it might destroy ministerial responsibility altogether".¹⁰ The House of Commons looked upon it as an attempt "to introduce a tyrannical and arbitrary way of Government".¹¹ The Commons wanted to control royal advisors and for this they had the weapon of impeachment. They held that "whoever gave the King advice, whether in public or in secret, should do so at his own peril, if the advice turned out to be bad". This was once for ever established in the case of Thomas Osborne, Earl of Danby—when he was removed to the Tower even in spite of the King's efforts to save him—that no minister could shelter himself behind the legal immunities of the throne. This gave rise to the dilemma which William Bennett Munro has depicted while saying that "surely this was a tight place for any minister to be in. If he disobeyed the instructions of the King he would be dismissed from Office; if he obeyed them he might be impeached by Parliament and sent to prison".

The solution was found subsequently, in the establishment of full parliamentary control over the Cabinet. Many years prior to Danby's dismissal, Commons had offered a solution (in the Grand Remonstrance) that the King ought "to employ such counsellors only.....as parliament may have cause to confide in". But Charles I would not listen to this proposal, if he had done so he might have saved both his throne and his head. Nor was it accepted by Cromwell during his term as Lord Protector. Charles II also disregarded it, and so did James II. Insistence of the House of Commons was rewarded soon. William and Mary conformed to the demand and it has not been seriously

10. C. Grant Robertson.....P. 185.

11. Munro.....P. 77.

disputed since that time. The Glorious Revolution ushered in a new epoch in the English Constitutional History. The one question since the Spanish Armada in 1588—whether the King or King-in-Parliament is to be the sovereign institution?—had been settled with exactly a century of blood and tears in favour of the latter alternative. The loss of life by one King; the failure of the first and the last constitutional experiment in the British History (1649-60) and the loss of throne by another King, taught a lesson by which never again did an English King insist upon the Stuart theory of absolute Kingship.

From 1688 “with each year the handcuffs on the arms of the Executive are provided with locks whose keys are in the custody of Parliament”.¹² The new era represents an endeavour to devise machinery for carrying out in actual Government the compromise settlement already reached. “Its most striking characteristic is institution—making and the chief institution made is beyond all question—English Cabinet, not meaning by that the Cabinet as a mere institution, but the Cabinet system of Government: the Cabinet as controlled by the modern contrivance and practice of ministerial responsibility”.¹³

The reign of William III did not see great advance in the Cabinet making. Mediating body still consisted of a small informal group of ministers who enjoyed the confidence of the King and who were influential in Parliament. The king never dreamed of allowing Parliament any voice direct or indirect, in the choice of his ministers. Though William III knew and accepted that the “King was to be distinctly below statute”, still it was Executive and not Parliament which determined the direction of Government policy and the executive was not yet under immediate Parliament control. Only a direct control over the appointment and dismissal of ministers could give Parliament

12. Adams.

13. Adams.

the real power. As yet not even a beginning had been made in this direction while selecting his ministers, he felt no binding obligation to consider their relation to the distribution of party strength in Parliament. A given man was put into office because he was an influential leader in Parliament and the nation but he grouped together as he pleased those men whom he wished to consult in a body, leaving out some the great officeholders and including on occasions some who were not among them. "He was not, and could not possibly be, an absolute king of the type of his perennial opponent, Louis XIV, but the English constitution had much growth to make before it could reach the king-ship of the twentieth Century."¹⁴

The whole conception of Cabinet was still rather individual than corporate. In fact the recognition of a corporate Cabinet and of its usefulness was wrought out by experience with coalition ministries. It was on the advice of the Earl of Sunderland, that William tried to select his ministers from one party—Whigs—after 1693. By 1696 the Cabinet noted as Junto was formed but it cannot be regarded as opening the continuous history of the modern Cabinet for in the election of 1698 when Tories won, the Whig ministry felt no obligation to resign. By and by, however, the ministry became more Tory.

Cabinet system, as such, was lacking in certain fundamentals at the time of the death of William. Firstly the small group of ministers had yet to be linked with the parliamentary majority. Secondly, impeachment was an imperfect tool to hold the ministers responsible for their acts of omission and commission. What was needed was not a means of punishing ministers for what they had done, but a means of making the authority of parliament effective throughout the process of deciding what to do. Impeachment itself seemed to be slipping out of the hands of the parliament without being replaced by anything worth

14. Adams.

being called a "rod". And thirdly, the royal right of absolute Veto (William used it four times and Anne once; never having been used since then) also excited indignation on the part of parliament.

"With abstract theories of 17th century Englishman had been fed to the verge of nausea."¹⁵ From this time starts what Mathew Arnold said as "our most indispensable eighteenth century". "Revolution Settlement was not a change but a conservation."¹⁶ "Queen Anne (also) remained a reigning monarch and this legacy she (as well) bequeathed to her predecessors."¹⁷ By the act of settlement it was made law that a pardon could not be pleaded to bar an impeachment. According to an Act, it was provided that "no person holding any office created after October 25, 1705 or certain other offices named, can sit in the House of Commons," and that any member accepting any other than these should vacate his seat, but might be re-elected." The reign of Anne constitutionally is a natural continuation of William's along the same lines and with the same character. Development of cabinet in her reign is not sudden and decisive but is in increasing understanding of how cabinet Government is to be worked and what it implies. In each of the three chief Cabinet changes of Anne's time the general election which soon followed returned a strong majority for the new ministry. More frequently and in a more marked degree than William III had done, Anne accepted ministers and ministries that she did not personally like. Yet, the prerogative of appointment and dismissal did express the likes and dislikes of the Queen's bed-Chamber. Moreover, "the people of the Queen's time did not see the connection between the three elements of the pro-

15. Sterling Taylor.

16. Trevelyn.

17. Keir.

blem, the parliamentary majority, the Cabinet and the successful carrying out of Government policy.”¹⁸

Infine, great progress was made between 1688 and 1714 in the transition to Cabinet Government*but greater still remained to be done. “It was no longer generally looked upon as an illicit, secret Cabal or Junto, dangerous to the power of Parliament and to be kept under and if possible legislated out of existence.”¹⁹. Nevertheless, sovereign was still regularly present at the meetings of the Cabinet and his will must have been a compelling influence in the decisions reached. In the relationship of Cabinet with the Parliament much ground was still to be covered. There was as yet no Prime Minister of the modern sort. It was not yet understood that the members of the Cabinet must be a unit on questions of policy and that the Government measures involved the fate of the Cabinet by their success or failure. The country had to wait for another full generation for the development of these principles. On the credit side the following foundations had been laid before 1714 :

- (1) The prerogative of the crown in notable directions had been limited and defined by two great statutes—the Bill of Rights and the Act of Settlement. According to the fundamental constitution of this Kingdom said Rochester in 1711, “Ministers are accountable for all.”
- (2) “Parliament, though it could not dictate policy nor the choice of ministers, could and did veto the action of the Executive.....As the cases of Clarendon, Danby, Somers showed, by impeachment it could indirectly remove ministers regarded as impossible.”

18. Adams.

19. Adams,.....P. 381.

- (3) "Since 1689 the system of defined and organised parties had made great strides.

"The accession of the House of Commons in 1714 was only a confirmation and extension of the principles that had placed William and Mary on the throne."²¹ At the time of George's accession Cabinet was ready for a great advance. "The necessary conditions had been thoroughly prepared. The mechanical form was virtually fixed. Experience enough had been gained to serve as a guide and to insure that few opportunities offered in the new circumstances of the time would be missed."²² The circumstances which introduced new epoch was the accession of the Hanoverian dynasty.

At the time of George's accession Cabinet was ready for a great advance. The necessary conditions had been thoroughly prepared. The mechanical form was virtually fixed. Experience enough had been gained to serve as a guide and to ensure that few opportunities offered in the new circumstances of the time would be mixed. George I was passed fifty. He would have found it very difficult to adapt himself to the strange conditions of his new kingdom even if he had earnestly tried to do so, and he had moreover, no wish to try. Lord Chesterfield has clearly depicted his character when he says that "George I had nothing great as a King and nothing bad as a man. He was an honest dull German, as unfit as unwilling to act the part of a King." He desired the Crown of England for a better position in North Germany. Another matter—though may seem an insignificant accident—was a prime factor in the result. The King knew no English and his Ministers knew no Germany. Conversation even with Walpole had to be carried on in Latin which, also was not fluent on any side.

George II had more interest in England and in English

20. Trevelyan.

21. Adams.....P. 383.

affairs but he was a man of very moderate abilities. He could not stop the current which had gone too far in his father's reign. Sir Walpole was firmly fixed in office. Besides this George II was a sort of hubby and his wife was a devoted friend of Walpole. At the same time George II did never try to violate the obligations under which he was placed according to the constitutional principles. What Kings provided was a mere opportunity. Impulse and direction came from the great Minister of the age. He was "the drill Sergeant of the Whig party." He was typical of his successors in the position which he created. His continuance in the office as well as his resignation from it have both become Constitutional conventions. He has been called the 1st Prime Minister of England. The Cabinet at the time needed a strict man who could maintain discipline in the party ranks, could ply the ship of the party through the onslaughts of the opposition and could select the Ministers. Walpole provided that required leadership.

Fifty years of Whig Oligarchy, according to Grant Robertson, added the following new features to the Cabinet development :

- (1) Character of the monarchy altered ;
- (2) Whigs became a party with a definite creed. They familiarised the nation and the Parliament with the idea of a ministry whose first function is to secure the realisation of a party programme ;
- (3) The withdrawal of the sovereign from presiding at Cabinet meetings weakened the initiation of the Crown and enormously strengthened the independence of Ministers ; it makes the existence of a Prime Minister possible ;
- (4) The management of Parliament for the execution of "the kings business" became indispensable.

- (5) The nature of ministerial responsibility was more clearly understood and ;
- (6) The Cabinet became more closely connected with the Executive departments of Government.

The advance of Cabinet development during 1742—1760 was not a marked one because the strong hand of Walpole had gone, without being replaced by any others. Neither Henry Pelham, nor New Castle nor Pitt possessed the qualities of Walpole. The party shade was also fading.

The only other time when the King of England tried to get back the power from Parliament and its Executive body—the Cabinet—was the time of George III. But the evil of his projected action was nipped with the loss of American Colonies and the fury of the French Revolution.

Questions

1. "Walpole's administration marks a stage in evolution of Cabinet Government". How ? (P. U. 1951)
2. Explain how the system of Cabinet Government developed in England. (P.U. 1945, 48)

CHAPTER III

JACOBITE RISINGS

Rising of 1715.

The union of English and Scottish parliaments completed by the Act of 1707, in spite of its tempting terms of equality did not give relief to the Scottish sentiments. The people grew dissatisfied and they broke into an open revolt, when they learnt of the accession of the Hanoverians in place of James Edward a descendant of the Stuarts. The Scottish people agreed to the rule of the Stuarts because they originally belonged to Scotland. The accession of the Hanoverians meant a foreign domination and it was not acceptable. Another cause of rising was the opposition of the majority of highlanders to the two Scottish nobles, Duke of Argyle and the Campbells who unfortunately were strongly supported by the Hanoverians.

In England too the prospects were not very bright. It was difficult to ignore the claims of James Edward popularly known as old pretender, simply because he was a Roman Catholic, and to prefer in his place a Hanoverian simply because he was a Protestant. The latter had never been in England. He was neither interested in England nor did he know the A. B. C. of the English language and people. The only consolation was that he was a protestant. But to install a man only on his religious views was illegal and unjustified.

During the reign of Queen Anne the chances of the Stuarts were very bright as she was inclined towards the Old Pretender, her younger brother. But unfortunately

James Edward professed his faith openly. He would have definitely succeeded Queen Anne if he had followed the policy of Charles II instead that of his father James II. The overt profession of Catholic faith spoiled his case. No doubt the nation did not like George I yet it could not tolerate James Edward who was a Catholic. It would have brought the country back under the domination of the Pope of Rome.

The Jacobites rose simultaneously in Scotland and England in 1715 under the leadership of Mar and Forster respectively. Many other dissatisfied chiefs, like Kenmure and Derwentwater joined them. They declared James Edward as the ruler of England and Scotland with the titles of James III and James VIII respectively, but they failed. They were defeated in Scotland at **Sheriffmuir** and in England they surrendered unconditionally at **Preston**.

James III personally landed in Scotland. But only a few were inspired by his presence. He was disappointed and returned to France. He deserted the innocent highlanders and left them at the mercy of the Government against whom they had revolted.

James III's failure in this struggle for power was certain. There were several reasons for it. He was without an organisation and a proper plan. The desertion of the French at the critical stage and the refusal of the English jacobites further aggravated his troubles. There would have perhaps been some chances had Ormonde been in a position to have a successful landing in the Southern England. It would have compelled the British Government to open a third front and then the chances of James III might have been brighter. But perhaps the accession of James III was not acceptable to nature even Ormonde failed to land. Moreover James Edward himself was not an inspiring personality. He had been a refugee since his birth and had been such an unfortunate man that his birth costed his father his throne.

The revolt failed and it brought untold miseries for the people who unfortunately took up his cause. It was once for all decided that the Hanoverians were to rule the country. It led to the passing of **Septennial Act**. It laid down that the election to the Parliament in future would take place after every seven years. It lessened the possibility of Pretender's restoration.

It confirmed the victory of the Parliament over the Crown and it led the people believe that the Roman Catholic King had no chances to reinstall himself in England.

Rising of 1745.

Though the jacobites failed in 1715 yet they remained determined in their attitude and longed for the restoration of Charles, a son of James III. Charles popularly known as Young Pretender unlike his father was brave and inspiring. Circumstances were also very favourable for his restoration in England as the two Georges were unable to impress the English people owing to their indifference towards the English politics. They were ignorant of the English politics and did not know the English language also. If the rule had been popular people would have tolerated it, but the Whig Ministers made the corruption order of the day and its prominent leaders like Walpole openly declared 'every man hath his price'.

England and France had joined opposite sides in the Austrian war of Succession. Thus Charles Edward could rightly expect a warm welcome from the French King also. The battle of Fontenoy brought disgrace to the party in power. Under such circumstances the young pretenders invasion of England had some chances of success.

But Louis XV. the ruler of France unfortunately underestimated the young pretender. He thought him to be

like his father and thus hesitated to lend proper support. Young Pretender, however, could not be checked in his ambitions by such reverses and he landed in Scotland only with seven followers. This throws sufficient light on his determination—so small was the number of his followers and so great was the project to be accomplished. He was quite hopeful and confident of his success. He had all those qualities which his father lacked.

The attractive personality of Young Pretender gathered around it a large following. The highlanders lacked only a leader and as soon as there was a leader like Young Pretender amongst them they lacked nothing. With the help of the highlanders he won victories at **Prestonpans** and '**canter of Coltbrigg**' and with six thousand followers started for the South via Carlisle avoiding a struggle with Wade who was at New Castle. Next he cleverly avoided Duke of Cumberland. And thus from Derby onward a road laid open for him for the the city of London. Charles was victorious everywhere. His victories so greatly disheartened George II, that he fled to the South with the intention of leaving for Hanover—the place where from his father had come to rule England about thirty years ago.

Unfortunately the young prince did not find the people of England so enthusiastic for his cause as he had found the people of Scotland. To capture England and then to keep it under control with the help of Scottish highlanders was not possible. The lack of English support disheartened the highlanders even and they began to go back to their country for safety. When the number of the followers became small, Charles, in a state of perplexity started on his journey back. He secured the greater part of Scotland besieged Stirling but when Cumberland got the better of him at **Culloden** he thought it better to escape for life. He spent his next six months amongst the highlanders; who never surrendered him to the British Government in spite of tempting reward of 30,000 for his person. He then escaped to

France. From there he started for Rome with an idea to pass the rest of his days with Pope.

In spite of the inspiring personality the Young Pretender failed owing to lack of English and French support. He had expected a lot from these people. The English no doubt disliked the Whig government, but they did not like to oppose it. Its peaceful policy had brought prosperity for the people.

The failure of the rising greatly discouraged the Young Pretender and the Jacobites. They never again dared to raise their head and the Hanoverian dynasty was established once for all in the soil of England.

Question

Give an account of the Jacobite risings of 1715 and 1745.

CHAPTER IV

STRUGGLES OF THE 18TH CENTURY

The War of the Spanish Succession

France and Spain were the two Chief powers in Europe during the 15th and 16th Centuries. Peace and war of Europe depended on them. During the last years of the 16th Century England came into prominence as a result of her victory over the Spanish Armada. Seventeenth Century was a long record of the growth of English power and the Spanish decline and a rivalry thus now began between England and France. Austria, Holland and Russia were the other three powers secondary to the two in Europe. Russia did not seem to have come so far in these political complications.

Spain in spite of its decline had vast possessions and when the Spanish King during the last years of 17th century began to show the signs of the decline of his health in the absence of a son, the Spanish question became a headache for the two rival powers England and France. Had the Spanish Empire been inherited wholly by a single European country it would not have been possible to maintain 'Balance of Power' in Europe.

Struggle began over the disposal of the Spanish remains. There were three claimants France, Austria and Bavaria, through their Queens Maria Theresa, Anne of Austria and Margaret Theresa first two of them indeed later on became more important. In order to avoid a struggle there had been a **Partition Treaty** by which a settlement had already been arrived at between the

English and the French rulers. It had been decided that the Prince of Bavaria should succeed to Spanish possession of Spain, the Indies and Netherland, Austrian claimant should have Milan and Luxemburg while the French candidate should rule over Naples and Sicily.

It is, indeed, interesting to note that England in spite of the fact it had no direct interest was still taking a very important part in the partition of Spain. The English King in no way could tolerate that the Spanish and French throne may be united as their unity would have broken the golden principles of 'Balance of Power' in Europe and had created a permanent danger for England.

The Spanish King, however, at the time of his death declared Dauphin the French candidate as his successor. Louis XVI the then French King when realised that by the partition treaty he is to lose he refused to go by its clauses with an excuse of the Spanish King's last wish. It was minded by the Austrians and the two nations began to make preparations for a war. The French King pre-supposing an English and Dutch hostility took some precautionary measures on the border of Holland and even withdrew the concession which they were enjoying in the Spanish colonies. He acknowledged James III the legitimate ruler of England after the death of James II and it was all the more objectionable. These considerations led to the joining of the opposite side by the English and the Dutch and thus everything hastened towards a crisis. England, Austria and Holland declared war on France and Spain. The participation of some of the other European powers on one side or the other made the war a sort of European war.

Duke of Marlborough, only second to Duke of Wellington in his capacity of a soldier, was appointed the Commander-in-Chief of the allied forces and the Austrian prince Eugene was second in Command. The French

defeats at **Cremona** and **Blenheim** dashed all their dashes for Vienna and their failures at **Ramillies**, **Oudenarde** and **Malplaquet** made it once for all clear to them that they were no match to the combined strength of the English, Dutch and the Austrians.

If the war, as is clear from the victories of the English and their allies, had been carried on, it would have led to the unconditional surrender of the French but to the misfortunes of the English there came in power the Tory party determined to bring an end of the war at the earliest howsoever lenient terms they might have to give. It was indeed too much anxiety of the English party in power for peace which did not allow the English to reap any fruit of those victories.

Treaty of Utrecht by which the war was brought to its close when seen with a deep eye seems to be insignificant in contrast with the victories which the English gained during the war.

It was agreed upon by all the high contracting parties that the French candidate should succeed the Spanish King in Spain but not to all the possessions of Spain which were indeed too large. He was to have Spain and Spanish Indies and these also with the condition that once the French candidate was a ruler of Spain he would have no more claims on the French throne or there would never be a single ruler of both the countries.

The Austrian candidate got Spanish Netherland, the Milanese, Sardinia and Naples and the Dutch got back the Barrier Fortresses from where they had been ousted by the French at the beginning of the war.

English people gained Gibraltar, the key of the Mediterranean Sea, Minorca, Newfoundland and Nova Scotia.

England was also given the sole right of Negro Trade and she could also trade with the South American colonies although the right confined to a single ship during the year. The French King promised not to take up the cause of the Old Pretender and acknowledged Anne as the legitimate ruler of England.

The War of the Austrian Succession

According to the laws of the European States no lady could be the ruler of a country. Charles VI, the Austrian Emperor, had no son but only a daughter called Maria Theresa. He was very anxious to promote her cause and he tried to ensure her accession by Pragmatic sanction. Being an influential King he got the consent of most of the European Kings, and thus died peacefully.

After the death of the Austrian ruler, Maria Theresa came to the throne of Austria. Some of the European powers refused to acknowledge her as a ruler, and ignored Pragmatic sanction to which they had given their consent during the days of the Austrian Emperor. Prussia went to the extent of marching upon Austria and capturing one of its fertile provinces called Silesia. The French also joined Prussia as they had not forgotten the Spanish War of succession where they had been humiliated by the combined forces of Austria and England.

The English joined on the side of Austria. If at all they joined in this struggle it was on account of their too much anxiety to test their strength with the French to whom they considered as their only rival in the colonies and in India. A deep study of the European politics will reveal that in Europe there were then only two important powers—England and France. All others were secondary. The two groups now came into an open conflict and as the struggle had its immediate cause in the capturing of Silesia, by the Prussians and not acknowledging the Austrian Queen

as the legitimate ruler, it was given the name of the War of the Austrian Succession.

The two sides were well balanced. So neither of the two sides was in a position to have a decisive advantage as had the English people during the Spanish War of Succession. One thing interesting in the struggle was the presence of the English King George II. It was for the last time that the English King personally led his forces in the battle field. There were two important battles during the War **Dettingen** and **Fontenoy**. In the first battle the Britishers got a victory but in the second they were defeated. The war lingered on but as the English did not find any gain in the struggle they came to terms quite against the wishes of their ally, Austria.

The Britishers and the French came into conflict in India as well as in America with the beginning of this war. The French had an upper hand and they won a victory in India and captured Madras. In America the English people had some partial success.

The war came to an end by the treaty of **Aix-la-Chapelle**. As a result of this treaty the Britisher and the French had the mutual restoration of territories captured during the war. The Prussians were to have Silesia and the Austrian Queen Maria Theresa was acknowledged as an independent and legitimate ruler of Austria.

Seven Years War

The seeds of the Seven Years War were sown in the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle. The Austrian Queen Maria Theresa had been mortally horrified when she learnt of the desertion by the English. The English people had come to some settlement with the French and the other opposite nations without the knowledge of the Austrian Queen. At

the time she remained silent, but she was determined to get back Silesia from the Prussians at any cost. Europe thus saw a diplomatic revolution. The Austrian Queen approached the French ruler as she considered the English fickle-minded. The French agreed to take up the cause of the Austrian Queen against the Prussians.

The Prussians had no alternative but to approach the English for counteracting the designs of the Austrian Queen. Europe was thus divided into two politically armed camps—Austria and France on one side, Prussia and England on the other.

No doubt, the English and the French had been in the terrible grip of war only a dozen years ago *i.e.* Austrian War of Succession but neither of the two sides had come out triumphant. Both of them being well balanced, the two sides were very anxious to test their strength and to see the final results of their struggle for supremacy in America and in India. The Seven Years War thus was not only to decide the fate of Silesia but it was also to see which of the two States, England and France, came out supreme beyond the oceans.

The war started disastrously for England. Its control being into incapable hands, the French got victories in every part of the globe and the English nation was passing through the darkest period of its history. It was at this critical stage that there appeared a man on the stage of English Parliament who had already been credited with the title of the only honest man in the Cabinet. He was none else but William Pitt. He thundered in the Parliament "I know that none else but I can save the country". The people approached New Castle, then at the head of the affairs of the state, to utilize the services of William Pitt. He was given the independent portfolio of defence and he brought the following changes in that existing system :—

- (1) He blockaded all the Seas and thus did not allow the French to send any help to their colonies in America and possessions in India.
- (2) He dismissed all those officers who were not fit for military service. He selected young officers for these jobs and imposed his confidence in them.
- (3) He helped the Prussians with war material and money and remarked "America must be won in Germany". His remark came out true. The French were kept busy by the Prussians in Europe and thus they could not send away help to their possessions abroad. The English forces which had been spared from Germany were sent in America and India.

Wolfe, a choice of William Pitt won the victory on the French general Montcalm in the **battle of heights of Abraham** and although the British general was killed in action but they had been the undisputed masters in America. The struggle had started in India disastrously. With the taking over of the war affairs by William Pitt, the tides of the war turned in favour of the Britishers. The French general Lally got some initial successes and he captured the fort of **St. David** and besieged **Madras**. Sir Iyer Coote was sent from Calcutta at the head of a grand army and he defeated the French in the battle of **Wandewash** and took Bussy a prisoner. Lally was also arrested and the British Government took such a terrible revenge on the French that not even a single roof was left intact in the city of Pondichary.

In Europe no doubt the English people were defeated in the beginning and they had to part with Hanover and

many other territories but the accession of Pitt to power definitely turned the tables of the war in favour of the Britishers. William Pitt had a mind to declare a war upon the Spaniards but his policy unfortunately was not approved by the House of Commons and he had to resign in a sheer disgust. A war against Spain had to be declared. The English people got a victory, The party in power was not capable of continuing war and thus it came to an end by the **Treaty of Paris**.

The French people were deprived of Canada, Nova-Scotia and many regions in Africa. They were restored their Indian possessions on the promise that they will not again fortify them and they will not participate in the political affairs of the Indian States. The French people were also compelled to give to the Britishers the island of Minorca.

The Spanish people were to part with Florida although they got back Manilla and Havaana. The Prussians were confirmed in Silesia and Maria Theresa was no more to claim those regions.

A struggle which had started between the French and the English in America and in India thus came to an end with the victory of the Britishers. They were now free to exploit the regions of India and the unexplored resources of America. It also led to a struggle between the English Government and the English colonies in America which culminated in the American War of Independence. Prussia which was up to this time a secondary power in Europe after her victories in the War of Austrian Succession and

Seven Years War came forth as the first rate power and became a prominent figure in the coming European struggles.

Questions

1. Account for and 'Trace briefly the Anglo French conflict during the 18th century'. (P. U. 1950)
2. Account for a revolutionary change in the diplomatic relations of Britain before the Seven Years War. (P.U. 1949)

CHAPTER V

WHIG OLIGARCHY

The period from 1714 to 1761 of English history has been called a period of Whig Oligarchy by some writers. The Whigs, during this period, held power and the Tories, had been thrown in the background. The Whigs ruled England without any opposition either from the Crown, or the Tories.

During the days of Charles II the House of Commons was divided into two over the Exclusion Bill. The members of the Whig party believed in enhancing the powers of the parliament. The Tories, on the contrary, supported the powers and the privileges of the Crown. Members of both the parties were Protestants. How so ever divided they might be on political issues, they could not tolerate a Roman Catholic King.

James II, when tried to revive the powers of the Pope of Rome and spread the Roman Catholic religion, both the parties stood as one against him and forced his exile. The event was given the name of Glorious Revolution.

As both the parties had invited William III, he equally patronised them and selected his Councillors from both the parties. Whigs and Tories were equally balanced during his days. In the reign of Queen Anne the Tories supported her policy, which might not be understood that the Whigs had opposed her. The two parties exchanged

hot words and turned the house into a battle-arena on the succession to Queen Anne. While the Whigs were in favour of the accession of Hanoverians the Tories supported the cause of the Stuart King James Edward, a son of James II. Queen Anne also supported the Tories as the Stuarts were nearer to her in every respect than the Hanoverians. The Tory party remained in power for a pretty long time during the days of Queen Anne.

The Tories were discredited in the eyes of the English people for taking up the cause of the Stuart prince. The English people could never tolerate the restoration of the Stuarts as the previous facts had convinced them that the successors of James II like him would be Roman Catholics. The Stuarts had a better claim than the Hanoverians on the throne of England. There is no concealing of the facts that the succession of the Stuarts was being opposed simply because they openly professed Roman Catholicism and the Hanoverians were being preferred simply because they were Protestants.

The accession of Hanoverians to the throne of England and the failure of the Stuarts now called as pretenders, to regain their ancestrals' throne opened a new chapter in the English History.

George I, the first Hanoverian King on the throne of England, was about 64 at the time of his accession. It was not possible for him to adapt to English customs and laws at this old age. He had passed the greater part of his life in Hanover so he did not know the English language. Moreover George I was not at all interested in the English affairs. If he had accepted the English throne it was because he wanted to be a respectable chief in Germany and thus to enhance the position of Hanover in the German political affairs. George I did not attend the meetings of the Parliament as he failed to understand its proceedings. The English people took serious notice of it. The Whigs, the party in power, made the best use of the

opportunity. They found within the ignorance of George I a chance for the establishment of a parliamentary rule which was their cherished dream. The Tories as they had opposed the Hanoverians were not to expect any favour from them. George I realising that it was by the support of the Whigs that he had come to the throne, patronised them and reposed his confidence in them. Thus there was the beginning of a period of Whig Oligarchy.

The Tories, who had taken up the cause of James Edward, known as Old Pretender, rose in his favour in 1715 simultaneously in England and Scotland but were defeated. They made their second attempt in 1745 in favour of Charles Edward, also known as Young Pretender, but again they failed miserably and the course of events had made it clear that the Hanoverians and not the Stuarts were to rule England during the years to come, no matter what drawbacks or short comings there had been in them. It also ensured the supremacy of the Whig party in the Parliament.

The Tories were now hated in England and were called as Jacobites. The Whigs, besides the support of the Crown, had many other advantages to their side. They included all the great personalities of the time in their party with the exception of Bolingbroke. The latter also left England after the rising of 1745 thus leaving the Whigs free in the field to rule the country in whatever way they deemed the best.

Majority of the Whigs being great land-lords or the representatives of the land owning class, they wielded a tremendous influence in the country side. Only the land owning class *i. e.* English Aristocracy held majority in the House of Commons and 2/3rd of the seats in the House of Lords.

The Whigs were also supported by the trading class. This class was fully satisfied with the peaceful policy of

the Whigs. The great financiers like Walpole, by their policy of non-interference and peace abroad had won a very high place in the minds of trading class and they had begun thinking that their prosperity was bound with the supremacy of the Whigs. The restoration of the Stuarts could have completely upset their programme so they were against it as well as against the supremacy of the Tory Party.

The Whigs never repeated the blunders of the Cromwellian period. They believed in the policy of non-interference in the public affairs. They gave toleration to the people. They were so much afraid of the public opposition that even some of the most useful measures were withdrawn when the public opposition was noticed for them. Walpole, one of the greatest leaders of the Whig party used to say, "Let sleeping dogs lie."

In spite of the fact that the Whigs hated war they proved themselves equal to the situation when they were entangled in the one. The war of the Austrian Succession and the Seven Years War were the two great struggles of their period of ascendancy.

With all these advantages they had become notorious for misusing their power. They were well-known for corruption. They had lowered the character of the nation by their open assertion of the principle 'Every man hath his price.' Corruption had been the order of the day. William Pitt, an other great leader had many a time warned the party and had predicted its fall in the near future for corrupt practices but he was ignored by the leadership. George II, a son and successor of George I, evinced keen interest in the English affairs though, he was a man of moderate means and was greatly influenced by his wife who herself was devoted very much to Walpole and failed to win back the privileges of the Crown. His efforts for them opened a new chapter. His successor

George III was free from all those drawbacks and during his days the Crown, recovered the lost powers.

The Whigs were the undisputed masters of England for a long time. Their long tenure of office and the absence of an opposition brought many corruptions in them. They were also internally divided into four parts :—

Aristocratic Whigs were led by New Castle while William Pitt was the leader of the Democratic. Bedford was the leader of Bloomsbury gang, which had no principles while the fourth group was under Grenville.

It is true that the Whigs had to their credit the victories of the Seven Years War, now at its full swing, but they had become very unpopular amongst the people due to their corruption and nepotism. George III, the next great king, made the best use of the internal division of the Whig party. The power and prestige of New Castle was very much lowered when the King took away from him the privileges and the powers of patronisation of the Crown which had been lost by the Crown during the days of George I and George II. William Pitt, the most popular leader of the Whig party, resigned when the parliament did not vote for a war against Spain. The unprincipled Bedford joined the King's friends when he was given a better position than he was already holding. Grenville also agreed to make a coalition Govt. with the King and thus was sounded the death-knell of the whig supremacy which had been the undisputed master in England for the last fifty years.

Questions

1. Account for the establishment of Whig ascendancy during early Hanoverian period. How was this broken by George III ?
(P.U. 1949)

2. Account for the ascendancy of the Whigs during the 1st half of the eighteenth Century. (P.U. 1944, 46)

3. Describe the aims and composition of the Whig and Tory parties in the 18th century. Account for the domination of the former in the first half of that century. (P.U. 1945)

CHAPTER VI

GEORGE III's PERSONAL RULE

The death of George II was an invitation to his grandson George III to ascend the throne of England. Since his childhood he had harboured in his mind the ambition of a personal rule. These aspirations were infused in him by his mother Augusta, tutor Bute and Bolingbroke through his book "The Ideas of a Patriot King". He ascended the throne of England on 25th October, 1760.

These inspirations, given to him by different persons, differed in outlook. The advice of Augusta, of ruling like her father in a despotic way if he were ever to rule, was completely opposed to the ideas of Bolingbroke. But George III tried to get the right notions from both. He acted in such a way that he was considered to have crowned the expressions of Bolingbroke and his own mother Augusta alike. He deleted those phrases of their theories which would have made him unsuccessful.

No doubt the phrase, "George, be a King". He never forgot; but he also never forgot that he was to become a patriot king, and was first of all to see the interests of the state and then his own. It will not be incorrect to say that he resembled Charles I in his intentions. Nevertheless he did not believe in those principles adopted by Charles I to get the powers in his

hands. He was well aware of the tragic end of Charles I and he was not going to repeat the blunder. Both the rulers declared that they wanted absolute powers for the interest of the common people but while Charles I tried to approach the people either directly or through his councillors George appealed the sentiments of the people directly as well as through the House of Commons.

George III in the beginning strove for those powers, which had been lost by his two predecessors owing to their ignorance of and disinterestedness in English affairs and their dependence on the Whig party which was in power at that time. George III went out of his limits fixed by Bolingbroke. But he had to come down from that climax of his power when the Parliament passed with an overwhelming majority Dunning's resolution, saying: "The influence of the crown has increased, is increasing and ought to be diminished." So long as he behaved like William III, he was successful but as soon as he acted like Charles I he was hurled down like the latter though his end was not as tragic.

George III came to the throne at a time when the English nation was the most respected and the strongest nation of the world owing to its victories in the Seven Years' War. It was a matter of pride, no doubt, but it is not incorrect to say that this prestige greatly lowered Kings' personal powers and increased the popularity of the party in power which was considered to be the main prop of keeping up the prestige of the nation abroad. The victories won by England were a thorn in the side of George III. They were great obstacles in the way of his personal ambitions. He would have preferred if England had been a defeated nation with a discredited party in power. Such a state of affairs would have made his work easy and allowed him to become absolute without difficulties. At the time of accession George III found the throne enchained and encircled by a group of

an influential class. This class had tightened its grip by its astounding victories in the Seven Years' War.

George III found himself in a critical position, but he did not lose heart as a result of a few reverses; Under the guidance of three inspirations he sailed his boat in the stormy waters of English politics. It was his courage, character, patience and diplomacy which made his work very easy. After ten years of hard labour he was in a position to say, in 1770, that he had crowned those ideas with which he had started. He, in 1770 was the ruler of England in name as well as in fact.

He availed himself of every opportunity which was offered to him. He always hit the right point at the right time and this increased his popularity.

Born and brought up in England he gloried in the name of Britain. The beginning of his first speech was enough to bring round the people of England. Those who had never heard such loving words from any monarch during the last half a century, were filled with joy and their hearts overflowed with new hopes, respect and love for their new English-born king. It will not be exaggeration to say that the English forgot even the glorious days of Elizabeth when they heard (or, learnt) from the sacred mouth of their king that he was to rule the country not for his own sake but for the interest and welfare of the people.

He attracted the innocent masses even more when he had a heart-to-heart talk with the common peasants. We can well judge the popularity of the King from the facts that he was given the name of "Farmer George", by the common people of England.

The Whigs owing to their being in the office for long duration and absence of effective opposition had become very careless and negligent in their duties.

William Pitt, the greatest commoner of the time was one of those statesmen, who steered the ship of Whig party through the stormy waters of English politics with success. But the weaknesses and corruptions of rule clearly predicted a dark future for that party. William Pitt, perhaps was the only honest man in the whole party. Walpole, an important and central figure of the party from 1720—42 used to remark, "Every man hath his price", and it were in fact the price of every voter that had kept those Whig members in the Parliament. The power of conferring titles, was the only instrument in the hands of New Castle, the greatest man of the Whig party, to make his following in the Parliament. William Pitt had rightly observed that the principal foundations on which the Whig party was enjoying these luxurious powers might result in its destruction and that came to be true soon after George III made capital out of this weakness of the Whigs. He took away the power of conferring titles from New Castle, and laid the foundation of his power on the very principles of corruption which had led the Whigs out of many troubles with flying colours.

The Whigs' long continuance in the office and their great majority in the parliament led to internal jealousies and divisions. At the accession of George III they had been divided into four different groups. The Aristocratic whigs, supporting this party for the sake of titles and Jagirs, were led by the Aristocratic leader New Castle ; while William Pitt, was leading the Democratic group of the Whigs. The Bloomsbury gang, which was not in any way different from mercenaries, was a group of members which could be hired by any party. Its leader was Bedford. The significant aspect of this group was that the whole of it and not a part was to be hired. The leader of the fourth group was Lord Grenville, the brother-in-law of William Pitt.

The internal jealousies of these four groups had

reached to such an extent that in case of a strong opposition this loose confederacy was sure to split into fragments at any moment.

The reason why, in spite of this rotten condition, and corruption the Whigs remained in power was the Tory leanings towards the Pretenders. Since the restoration of the Pretenders was now nothing better than a vain dream, the attitude of the people towards the Tories underwent a complete change. The Tories, who after their vain attempts of 1715 and 1745 had been dissatisfied with the Pretenders and considered their cause as a hopeless one, were now inclined to support the crown. George III himself was inclined to listen to them and enlist their support. The Tories began to support the cause of George III with the same zeal, with which they had taken up the cause of the Pretenders. The support of the Tories gave new hopes and encouragement to George III.

George III reduced New Castle to the status of an impotent rival by resuming the patronage of crown. George III next turned his attention to William Pitt. To tackle him was rather a difficult affair. He was very popular in England and swept the polls very easily by patriotic speeches and practical work. In case of William Pitt diplomacy came to the rescue of George III. On one side he encouraged William Pitt in his hostile attitude against Spain and on the other instigated the members of Parliament saying that William Pitt was prolonging the Seven Years' War for his personal benefit and popularity at the cost of the economic welfare of the country.

The instigation had the desired effect and when the greatest commoner asked for a war against Spain in the House of Commons he contrary to his expectations, found the House opposed to his resolution. Pitt at once resigned and predicted a definite war with Spain, the pre-

parations for which he had already begun. This incident took place on 5th October, 1761. The prediction came to be true and England was dragged into a war with Spain. England even won this war. No doubt the war was not directed by William Pitt but the credit of victory went to him because the war preparations were completed by him and not by his successors. The King was very jealous of the popularity of William Pitt. He called him 'The Trumpet of Seditions' but was also obliged to give him the title of 'The Earl of Chatham'. Newcastle found the dictations of George III too chafing. The number of his followers also decreased so he resigned and made room for Bute, once the tutor of George III. Bute was no good as a minister. He might have been successful owing to his charming manners as an ambassador in some foreign country. The heavy responsibility of concluding of Seven Years War by the Treaty of Paris, fell upon the inexperienced shoulders of Bute-Paramour of George III's mother according to many English historians. He proved quite incompetent for the job and became so unpopular owing to the lenient terms which he gave to the French, that he was compelled to resign from his post, within a year.

The King was perplexed over the question of the selection of members of the Cabinet. The Tories and the 'King's Friends'—creation of his corruptive means, stressed upon him the need of a vigorous action. They advised him to nominate his cabinet members without consulting the Whigs. The suggestion did not appeal to the King. The Whig party still enjoyed a majority in the House of Commons and it was in favour of that old democratic system of selection which had been prevalent from 1714 to 1760.

In 1763 there were three important groups of the Whigs each being led by a leader. George III was now not only to see the popularity of a leader but also the suitability together with his will of co-operation with the

King. Rockingham had more following than Grenville or Bedford, the other two leaders, but he was shy and was not expected to succeed in those troubled times. Grenville was found the most suitable. As he had already proved himself co-operative during the period of Bute, he was given the high responsibility. It was during this period of Grenville's ascendancy that a scandal called "**Wilkes case**" took place. The question arose on the publication of an objectionable article in No. 45 of the North Briton. The question in the beginning was a purely personal one, i.e. arrest of Wilkes, a member of the Parliament, on a general warrant but in the long run it became a national question and Wilkes turned into a national hero. The King and the Party in power favoured his persecution and were against his admission to the Parliament in spite of his being elected thrice. The public was in favour of Wilkes and his admission to the Parliament. The struggle ended in a victory for the people. The Parliament secured public liberty declared the general warrants illegal. Grenville became very unpopular.

No doubt Grenville was at the head of the English affairs with the consent of George III but the latter did not like him. Grenville was a Whig, while the king wanted one who would blindly accept dictations from him. Grenville became unpopular on the question of the Stamp Act. Now it became easy for George III to dispense with Grenville. The Cry against the Stamp Act was supported in England by men like William Pitt. George III was not prepared to court the least unpopularity. He preferred to sacrifice his minister upon his honour and declared, "I will sooner meet Mr. Grenville at the point of my sword than to admit him in my cabinet." This led to the downfall of Grenville and he was succeeded by the vacillating and shy Rockingham. He failed to prove equal to the occasion. The occasion called for a strong man. He passed the 'Declaratory Act' and repealed the Stamp Act. The Declaratory Act which declared that the British Government had the right to tax the colonies.

was a conciliatory measure and it could not please either of the two sides. George III was thus obliged, much against his own will, to call upon the 'Trumpet of Seditions' to bear the burden of authority. William Pitt unfortunately, did not find himself in a position to take any effective part in solving the tedious problems owing to a gout trouble. After two years he resigned in 1768.

•

In 1770 Lord North, a puppet of George III was appointed the head of the English affairs when all the leaders of the Whig party except William Pitt had been discredited one after the other owing to their mismanagement of the affairs. George III would not have called upon so many Whig leaders and then bundled them out, but for his wrong choice of Bute in 1762.

During the period of Lord North the personal rule of George III was at its height. He, in fact, was all in all and the ministers used to get their dictations directly from the King. He had attained that position which his mother wished him to achieve. He was now a King not only in name but also in reality. Every thing, which attains a climax, is bound to fall. Similar was the case with the personal rule of George III. The end was a tragic one indeed. The war of American independence happened to be a black star on the horizon of the King's fate. It was the obstinacy of George III which prevented the two countries from coming to any settlement. When once the King was pressed for a settlement he burst out :

"It would be better to give up empires than to admit even a single particle of these principles".

In fact, the power of the English colonies was underestimated and "Four Regiments will be sufficient in

America" had become a proverb¹ in England. This under-estimation led to the neglect of adequate preparations for the war. The consequences were disastrous for England. Lord Cornwallis the last hope of England surrendered to the Americans at York town and when the news was conveyed to North he exclaimed! "O, God, It is all over." The loss which was in fact an unbearable one opened the eyes of the English and Dunning's resolution, saying that "the influence of the Crown has increased, is increasing and ought to be diminished" ended the personal rule. The King again tried to regain his powers during the period of younger Pitt, but he could not succeed. Insanity and old age gave the final blow to the King's ambitions.

George III could not prove himself a patriot King—a King of the dreams of Bolingbroke. He crossed the limits of his authority while riding on his ambition-horse blindly. He met a tragic end and was never in a position to regain that old prestige. The attempt for personal rule was not constitutional and was responsible for the loss of the American colonies. The days of English greatness were over. The prestige, built as a result of the Seven Years' War, was lost. The King himself being an unenlightened monarch proved a steady hindrance in the way of all reform movements and it was only after his exit from this universe that some of the grievances of the people were redressed by the Reform Act of 1832. But, in spite of all these drawbacks, he accomplished a great work, the breaking of the corrupt Whig oligarchy. Green vividly sums up the personal rule of the English King in the following words:—

"Whilst labouring to convert the Aristocratic Monarchy, of which he found himself the head, into a personal sovereignty the irony of fate doomed him to take the first step in an organic change which had converted the Aristocratic monarchy into a democratic [republic ruled under monarchical form".

Questions

1. 'George, Be a King'. How did George III succeed in his attempt to rule as well as to reign ? (P.U 1951)

2. George 3rd governed "without party" making the Cabinet a mere instrument of the royal will and the Parliament a pensioner of the royal bounty. The result was by no means in accord with Bolingbroke's prophecies of the golden age, that was to follow the advent of a "patriot King" independent from all political faction. (Trevelyan) Explain and discuss this Statement.(P.U. 1946)

3. Write an account of the attempt of George III to exercise personal Government, and explain briefly the most important consequences of that attempt. (P.U. 1942)

CHAPTER VII

AMERICAN WAR OF INDEPENDENCE

It is impossible to deprive a nation or a man of his birth right and natural gift of liberty forever. Every one who is born in this world must be a free man. Even the humblest creature of the world loves liberty. No country, similarly, can remain under the foreign yoke. Sooner or later it will achieve its liberty, when ever the circumstances permit. So was the case with the Americans. To keep them under constant control was an impossibility. Those people who had left their homes, for good only owing to religious differences with the rulers of their motherland could not be expected to tolerate any unjustified act and to rot under the yoke of slavery. Every slave nation strives for its liberty and all those who try for freedom and make sacrifices, succeed in attaining their long cherished goal. The Americans, similarly, fought against the British imperialism, for their freedom and their struggle has been given the name of American War of Independence.

It was not a sudden outburst. But it had got its seeds in the last several decades. The fire of hatred was burning in the heart of the American colonists since long, only a petty incident was sufficient to flare up the flames. The need of the spark was fulfilled by the unjustified demand of taxing the colonies by the British Parliament and the fire ablazed so strongly that it could not be extinguished.

The theory put forward by several authors that the fire of freedom and hatred could have been put out once for all and conflict be avoided, seems to be too bold an assertion. It can, to some extent, be believed that had there been some far-sighted man, familiar with the internal fire of patriotism of the Americans the conflict could have been avoided for some time and England could have been in a position to challenge these rebellions. Of course the revolution could have been checked by love and justification and not by firing of guns.

The primary factor of this great event was the end of French power owing to seven years war in America. With it came an end of the struggle which was going on between the English and the French colonists for supremacy. In the absence of help from the mother-country there was no chance of success for the English colonists in the struggle for supremacy against the French colonists. What to talk of success, even the existence of the English colonists would have been in danger. This constant danger of the French colonists compelled the English colonists to keep good relations with the mother country even at the cost of a very high price. What ever the mother country proposed the English colonists agreed to it without any opposition. The seven years war decided that the English and not the French were to remain in America. It also freed the English colonists to deal with the unjustified demands of the mother country. It will not be incorrect to say, "With the triumph of Wolfe on the heights of Abraham began the history of United States of America."

No doubt, the English triumphs in seven years war made them the strongest and the most dreadful power of Europe, but their internal conditions greatly deteriorated. The country became bankrupt and its finances were in great disorder. It was at this critical stage that the British Government, in order to meet its growing expenses, asked the English colonists to share those ex-

penses, and at least to pay that amount which the English Government had to spend in those battles which she fought for the defence of 13 colonies in America. The demand was in fact a justified one. But neither the time nor the method of realising was suitable. Thus it was, at once, rejected by the Americans. Lord Grenville, at that time was at the head of English affairs. He was a man of principles and he considering the demand justified, passed '**Stamp Act**'. By it all the future business transactions in America were to bear a British Stamp and the money thus realised was to go to the English treasury. The colonists refused to make this payment, taking their stand on the principles of "**No taxation, without representation**". Grenville was also not ready to withdraw the Stamp Act as it was not only justified but also within the limit of powers of English Parliament. to pass it. It was an unfortunate moment in English history that a great statesman William Pitt favoured the colonists and encouraged them by declaring. "I rejoice, the Americans have resisted." There were now two ways open for Grenville, either to withdraw the Act and openly confess his failure or to insist on the Act. Perhaps he would have insisted as he was constitutionally correct but political thinkers like Burke and William Pitt greatly discouraged him. The former by declaring that though constitutionally justified, it was not an opportune moment to insist upon it, where as the latter openly declared the measure unjustified. Last, but not the least, George III, who was very much busy in building his party, found the correct occasion of discrediting Grenville and ruined his cause by openly declaring that "I would soon meet Mr. Grenville at the point of my sword than to admit him in my cabinet." Grenville was not so unpopular as he became after the open hostility of George III, who was ready to sacrifice any man from his party to save himself from criticism and unpopularity. Rockingham a shy and vacillating man now came to power. The colonists considered the resignation of Grenville the result of their successful agitation and the repeal of Stamp Act confirmed their belief. Rockingham passed '**Declaratory Act**' by which he declared

that the British Government had the right to impose taxes on the colonies. The declaration was of no value, in the absence of its enforcement on the colonists. This cheap measure not only turned the English nation against him but it also further estranged relations of England with the colonies. Rockingham was succeeded by William Pitt who was not only respected in England but was also honoured in the colonies.

A definite understanding was now expected between the colonies and the mother country but the disease of gout clouded the mind of William Pitt. He could not take any effective measure and the problem of settlement remained unsolved. Townshend, the chancellor of Exchequer, imposed duties on Tea, colour, glasses and paper but these also had to be withdrawn owing to the increasing opposition of the Colonists and the work of settlement was now transferred to Lord North who came to power in 1770. Lord North repealed duties on all the articles except tea. He was an incapable man and estranged the relations between the two countries to such a stage without any material advantage to the country, that now the need was only of a spark which could blaze up those stores of hatred gathered together in the hearts of the colonists. The duty on Tea was kept only to confirm the British right of taxing the colonies. The Americans also were not to suffer any financial loss. But it was, against their principle of "No Taxation, without representation." Taking this stand they had been fighting for the last several years. When neither of the two sides came to terms the war became inevitable.

The Second Factor, which led the two countries to wards destructive war was the Trade restrictions, imposed by the British Parliament over American colonists. In fact they were being exploited heavily. We can well judge their condition, by noting the fact they were not allowed to manufacture those articles which were manufactured by

England although the Americans could manufacture them with great advantage. Raw Material of the colonies was purchased at a low price and the finished goods were supplied to the Americans at high prices. The colonists were not allowed to trade with any other country. One example is sufficient to show their hopeless position. Any article imported from West Indies was first to go to some port of England and then it was to be exported to America after paying duties there. Further they could not use but English ships or those ships which were having English sailors for the purpose of their trade. English colonists, who had preferred to leave their homes rather than to accept the religion of their Kings could not tolerate these restrictions. This economic exploitation had, several times, been resented by the colonists, but they were compelled to remain silent owing to the fear of the French colonists. 'The English Government remained ignorant of this internal fire of the colonist'. The general outlook prevalent in European countries that the colonies were for the betterment and benefit of the mother country, prevented the English to know the real feelings of the colonists.

Since the time of their establishment in the different Eastern parts of America, these thirteen English colonies had been enjoying the right of self government and each of these colonies had got its own assembly, whose members were the representatives of the different parts of the colony. The danger of French aggression had compelled these colonists to ask the mother country for protection. The mother country, side by side with the military help, appointed governors to all these colonies. The assemblies of the colonies were enjoying all the privileges, enjoyed by the British parliament and the governors were there to perform the duties as King's agents. Within the last century a struggle was visible between these assemblies and the governors and these assemblies several times, following the footsteps of English Parliament of 17th century, refused to vote supplies to the governors. The governors also, like the English Kings, collected several

taxes forcibly, without the sanction of the assembly. The relations of the governors, appointed by the Crown with the Assemblies, elected by the people, before the war of Independence were actually the same as were in England of Charles I with the Parliament before the Civil War. An American historian has well remarked, "No one but Englishmen established American independence and this they did on the basis of English history. Once the Americans had been given the privileges of self-government it was not possible to withdraw them."

Last, but not the least, fact that we are to note is, that the English colonists in America, had not left their country willingly. They were either turned out of England or compelled to leave it owing to the religious policies of the Kings. So they had no love for their mother Country. The mother country did not care about them when they left the country in a miserable condition, for those unknown lands of America, where there was neither safety of life nor bright future. But when they became prosperous the mother country thought to bring the colonial child in her lap. The colonists well knew all their tactics but they were compelled to remain silent owing to unfavourable circumstances created by the French. The removal of French danger freed them to demand from the mother country all the privileges which were necessary for every grown up person in England. The English, hesitated to give them their due share and privileges, and tried to put them off, by making hollow promises. This compelled the colonists to raise the standard of revolt and to win by force those rights which had been denied to them. As a result of war they gained more than they had demanded. An American historian writes, "The British empire was doomed to be broken asunder but it was brought to that disaster by the insistent demand of the Englishmen in America for the full enjoyment of those liberties which England had fostered beyond any other country of the world". Prof: Hunts vividly remarks, "The American revolution must have come sooner or later though the date

of its coming and the violent means by which it was accomplished were decided by individual actions". The resentment of the Americans can further be judged from the despatches of Lord Cornbury, Governor of New York during the days of Queen Anne, to the mother country. He writes,

"If once they can see they can clothe themselves without the help of England, they, who are already not very fond of submitting to Government would soon think of putting into execution designs they have long harboured in their hearts".

In spite of all these warnings and later protests made by the English colonists against tax on tea, the British Government ignored them and sent three ships full of tea from India to the port of Boston. The Americans took a strange course to stop this import. They went to the port in the guise of Red Indians and threw the whole of the tea into the sea. Afterwards they rejoiced celebrating the incident as '**Boston Tea Party**'.

The Boston incident created a stir in England. From every quarter of England came the cry of taking a very strong action against the miscreants. Under the pressure of Public opinion and the King, the port of Boston was closed for trading purposes and the colony of Massachusetts was deprived of all its trading privileges. The general understanding in England was that the reaction of such an act will be good on other colonies. All the colonies were jealous of one another in matter of trade and with the ruining of Massachusetts' trade it was thought, the other colonies would be benefited. But it produced completely unexpected results. Those thirteen colonies which could not combine themselves against the French, quite against the hopes of England met together to protest against the arbitrary policy of the British Government. They sent a petition to the English King to reconsider his attitude towards the colony of Massachusetts. But the King was firm in his attitude and his remark, "It would be

and arms was responsible for this degeneration. The majority of the Americans, now considered the cause of liberty in spite of the **Declaration of Philadelphia**, a hopeless cause and it was only the calm determination of Washington which kept the remaining armies together and did not allow them to go asunder. The tables of the war were turned, when Washington entrapped and compelled General Burgoyne to surrender at **Saratoga**. The victory was the turning point in the struggle for independence. Washington received not only the whole hearted support of the Americans who were now at his beck and call but France and Spain also openly declared war against England to avenge the defeat of Seven Years War. Holland also joined in the later stages. The French supplies rejuvenated the American soldiers and made the chances of English victory very gloomy. From a domestic affair it overnight became a world wide affair and the surrender of Cornwallis at **York Town** clearly decided that it was the cause of England and not that of the Colonists which was hopeless.

When the news of surrender reached England it became clear to Lord North that further resistance was useless.

The French and the Spaniards tried to capture Gibraltar but failed. England, without intimation to France or Spain secretly came to terms with America. She acknowledged her independence and thus saved herself from humiliation which would have visited her, had she been compelled to accept the terms of France or Spain. There was nothing humiliating in the Treaty of Versailles and the English made an honourable settlement, but none failed to say that the days of the English glory were over.

Treaty of Versailles

When the news of surrender of Lord Cornwallis at York Town reached Lord North, he exclaimed, "O. God! It is all over".

In spite of George III's insistence, Lord North refused to remain in the office and resigned. The work of settling the terms of treaty fell upon Shelburne. England, no doubt, grudgingly acknowledged the independence of U. S. A., and even fixed boundaries between U. S. A. and Canada; but she was not ready to submit to France and Spain in any way and keeping that point in view, she had already entered into a separate secret treaty with America. Thus France and Spain could not gain much as a result of the war. * France got St. Lucia and Tobago in West Indies, Senegal and Goree in Africa, her Indian trading stations and right of fisheries in New Foundland. Spain got Minorca and Florida but she had to restore Bahama isles to the English. Holland and England agreed on mutual exchange of their conquest.

Results and Significance

The American Revolution not only brought changes in England but also effected Europe. In England, it was responsible for the end of George III's personal rule and it made the English people conscious of the fact that the days of their glory were over. It taught them a lesson and in future they were considerate in their attitude towards their possessions. After the loss of 13 colonies, the English set out on their journey to the East and began to settle in Australia and its neighbouring islands. It also effected France. The French were, up to a certain extent, responsible for the freedom of

America. The French volunteers had helped the Americans in their war of independence. When they returned to their country, they began to propagate against the despotic rule of the King and shouted "If they could liberate America why could they not liberate themselves" French revolution to some extent was the result of successful American revolution.

Causes of English defeat

A nation which under-estimates the power of her enemies seldom wins a war. Similar was the case with the English people. They under estimated the power of the colonists and did not make elaborate preparation for a war. When it actually began, it was a problem to face it. There was utter disorganisation in England. It culminated in the independence of the colonies.

In the 18th century when the communications system had not fully developed, it was not possible to move the forces speedily, and the position deteriorated still more when the generals were not given independence of action and were supposed to follow the instructions sent from home. These instructions often reached there late and thus were rendered useless. The position became still more grave, when the French hampered the supplies sent from home to the British forces fighting in America.

It was a great advantage to the Americans that they were fighting in a land, of which they knew each and every inch. They were fighting for their independence and the whole of the American nation supported them. The English, on the contrary, had no such cause to fight for and they were completely unfamiliar with the lands of America. They were demoralised, when they found the whole nation hostile to them. They were fighting for a lost cause and their downfall was delayed because the Americans received the French and Spanish

supplies rather late and also owing to the initial victories of English forces who had earned sufficient experience in Seven Year's War.

Questions

how Great Britain came to lose her American colonies. (P.U. 1947)

2. What were the issues at stake in the American war of independence. (P.U. 1945)

3. Account for the American war of Independence and trace its bearing on the colonial' policy. (P.U. 1949)

CHAPTER VIII

IRISH QUESTION IN THE 18TH CENTURY

The Irish people, since the days of Henry VII when the **Poynings laws** had completely deprived them of their legislative independence, had been under the domination of England. The people tried to liberate their country during the next five centuries but the grip of British imperialism could not be loosened. It was after the 1st World War, when every-where on the globe there were national risings and ideals of democracy were accepted that the poor nation got its independence from an imperial Government. Under the topic of Irish question we have to study the movements of the Irish people under different leaders and different organisations and their failures and successes.

England with the advent of the reformation movement, became a protestant country, though its Government in spite of its complete break with Pope of Rome, never professed Protestantism as its state religion and there the people as a whole were not protestants. But this was not the case with the people of Ire-land. Neither the Thirty Years War nor the persecution policy of the English King affected them and the country as a whole remained truly Roman Catholic.

Their religious bigotry can be well judged from the fact, that in spite of an unpopular rule of the representatives of Charles I in Ireland the Irish took up his cause against the Parliament simply because he was fighting the

Puritans. The war subjected them to untold miseries and with the execution of their King there began a long period of their persecution which is unequalled in the history of Ireland. Cromwell, after suppressing their revolt, inflicted upon them horrible punishments and so cruel was his treatment towards the people of Ireland that they could never again be reconciled during the coming centuries, in spite of the repeated efforts of succeeding monarchs to please them by granting one concession or the other. They were indifferent to these favours and had determined to come to terms only on one point and that was the grant of full-fledged liberty to the Irish people and Ireland's separation from England. There were alternate periods of relief and persecution and the nation bravely suffered all these hardships.

James II, a leader of the Roman Catholics gave them relief but the relief which he gave to Irish and other Roman Catholic people cost him his throne. They unsuccessfully fought for his successors, the Pretenders, and then their reverses led them to face the hardships of a period of slavery. They were ready to face troubles and at the same time were determined to see the movement of liberation going on, though not with that intensity which they had shown in the early stages.

The Whigs, who believed in the policy of "let sleeping dogs lie," did not disturb them and they also did not feel sufficiently strong to launch a movement. Thus the Irish question went into the background for a period of about half a century.

The Irish people had many grievances, political, religious and economic. It was a tragedy for the Irish people that they were being exploited by the very nation which had executed one of their rulers and turned out the other for its democratic principles. The Irish people had a Parliament but a Parliament only in name and not

in fact. Three fourth of the population which professed Catholicism was not allowed to vote for the Parliament. The remaining $\frac{1}{4}$ who were Protestants and had their representatives in the Parliament had their own economic and political grievances. Thus neither the represented nor the unrepresented were satisfied; and when the nation as a whole was dis-satisfied, it was not possible to keep it under control for an indefinite period. The Parliament of Ireland was bound to ask for the approval of English Council for any measure it passed and the British Parliament could pass for Ireland any law, which was binding on its people. Test Act was another obstacle in the way of the majority of the Irish people as it had debarred them from getting Government appointments. One Lord Lieut. was appointed by the British Government for the administration of the country. The disinterestedness of the Lord Lieut., the supreme authority in the Irish affairs, can be imagined from the fact that he was present in Ireland only during the sessions of Parliament. For the remaining period he was in England enjoying high society, caring little for the down-trodden people of Ireland who were to be looked after by his agents, who carried on the Government for their personal profit. It was not a Government but an earning concern and it will not be an exaggeration if we call this period the darkest period of Ireland.

They had also many **economic grievances**. They had no liberty of Trade and their economic exploitation can be well judged from the fact that they could neither manufacture any article in their country which was manufactured in England nor could they export or import articles directly. They were also not enjoying those trading privileges which had been extended to the English merchants and in the countryside some sort of famine prevailed owing to the exploitation of the landless peasantry of Ireland by the landlords of England. During the Common Wealth period the Irish people had been deprived of their lands and their lands had been

allotted to the English landlords ; and thus they had been turned into virtual slaves. The English Zamindars never took the trouble of visiting Ireland personally and to see the rotten condition of their tenants. They had their agents in Ireland with instructions to squeeze as much money out of the scanty resources of the poor farmers as might be possible. The poor peasants could not resist the exploitation as there was hard competition amongst themselves. They could have thought of a common cause, if the danger of land being converted into pastures—thereby starving them to death—had not stared in their eyes.

The majority of the people had to pay for the maintenance of that church in which they had no faith and which they never attended. They were not allowed to join Government service because they were Roman Catholics. They were not allowed to vote or to sit in the Parliament because of their religion.

All these grievances in no way allowed them to be contented and, day and night, they were thinking of breaking off all connections with British Imperialism.

With the accession of George III there was a change in the Government and the power shifted from the Whig Oligarchy to the King. The Irish people vainly expected too much from the new Government in the form of concessions. But the concessions given to them were not according to their expectations, as they got only Octennial Act by which Irish Parliament was to be elected at least once in eight years.

The year 1775 witnessed a revolution in the history of America—a revolution which indicated the sentiments of the Americans against their exploitation by British imperialism. The Irish people who were similarly being exploited were supposed to make a common cause with

the Americans but they did not do so. They, instead joined the British Government with the false hope of getting concessions by showing loyalty to an exploiting master. There was another consideration also. They fell into the trap of British diplomacy. Not only the Irish but also the French colonists of Canada joined Britain because the Britishers painted the picture of war in different colours. It was not shown to be a war between an imperialistic state and an exploited colony but a war fought on religious principles. The Canadians got religious freedom and the Irish people sacrificed their lives in the foreign country with the satisfaction that they were fighting out a war against the American Puritans.

The British Government, while taking into consideration the loyalty of the Irish people during the American war of Independence and the valuable services which they had rendered during the war, gave them **legislative independence in 1782**. It was a measure of advantage only to the Irish minority. No doubt some trading restrictions were also removed but the majority of the masses, who were hit hard owing to religious disabilities maintained an indifferent attitude and to them the independence of Parliament meant only the change of masters. They were now at the mercy of the Irish protestant minority and in spite of the fact that Grattan relaxed some penal laws, it failed to satisfy the people.

The French Revolution broke out in the meantime with its principles of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity. In England it was received favourably but not as in Ireland. The disappointed Irish people tried to throw in their lot with the French people. A society of **United Irishmen** was started. Both Roman Catholics and Protestants were its members. They wanted to set up an Irish Free state under the protection of the French Republic which had declared unconditional help to all those countries which revolted against their despotic or imperialistic masters. The idea was not liked by some of the

extreme protestants of Ireland who formed a party named **Orangemen** to oppose the United Irishmen. The British Government could get some help from this society, but it could not suppress the agitation which was going on in Ireland. The British Government then resorted to other means. To kill the movement, it gave concessions to the Roman Catholics. They were allowed to vote for the Parliament and even **Pitz William promised Catholic emancipation**. But the second measure, howsoever tempting it might have been, did not satisfy them. It kindled the fire still further and the Irish people realised that by continuous agitation they would be in a position to gain something more.

The British Government after giving some encouragement to the Irish people, unfortunately, tried to retrace its steps. This proved to be a blunder. The Irish people in a desperate mood invited the French. A storm prevented the latter from landing in Ireland but it opened the eyes of the British Government, and made them understand the gravity of the situation. Several repressive measures were taken against the Irish people, but instead of suppressing them, it made their movement go underground. The British Government realised that in case the Irish Catholics were allowed to sit in the Parliament they being in majority there, would immediately break relations with the British Government. So it was felt necessary to unite the Parliaments of both the countries before the concession was given to the Irish. The unity was planned in such a way that the Irish Catholics in spite of their majority amongst the Irish members were in minority in the English Parliament. Lord Cornwallis the then Lord Lieutenant in Ireland approached the protestant members and the latter agreed to the Union by accepting some bribe and also realising the future menace of Catholics. The Catholics also agreed when they were promised a Catholic Emancipation Act. The following were some of the clauses of the **Union Act of 1800** :—

1. Both the countries were to have a united Parliament and the Irish people were asked to send 100 members to the House of Commons and 32 (including 4 of Church) to the House of Lords of the English Parliament.

2. Both the countries were to have a common church and a common army.

3. Free trade was allowed between the two countries.

4. In the internal affairs *i.e.*, Law courts and executive affairs, the Irish people were to have their separate institutions.

The Younger Pitt, the then Prime Minister realised that a great work had been accomplished, not knowing that a still greater work *i.e.*, Catholic Emancipation, in which he failed, was awaiting him. The Younger Pitt introduced the Catholic Emancipation Bill in the Parliament but it was defeated owing to the opposition of George III. When the Irish people learnt of the actual position they raised a hue and cry and the Irish Union Act, due to their opposition, remained a half measure.

Thus during the 18th century the Irish problems in spite of some attempts to solve them by a constitutional measure in reality remained unsolved.

Questions

1. Examine briefly the political relations between Great Britain and Ireland up to 1800.

2. What were the grievances of the Irish people during the 18th century?

CHAPTER IX

OUTSTANDING PERSONALITIES OF THE 18TH CENTURY ENGLAND

Duke Of Marlborough

Duke of Marlborough, whose original name was John Churchill was one of the greatest generals of the English History. He was born in 1650 and he lived upto a ripe age of 72. He served under James II, William III and Queen Anne, the three rulers of England. He was not sincere to his friends and masters and he betrayed them whenever there came a question of his personal interest. Winston Churchill a descendant of Duke of Marlborough, however, tries to prove that the great Duke was not an unprincipled man.

He joined the Tories but he soon left them when he found them arrayed against his war policy. But for his desertion James II would have taken a stand to the Dutch forces of William when they landed in England during the revolution of 1688. It was a shock to James II as he had always favoured John Churchill.

He was even once found conspiring against William III in favour of Queen Anne whose accession would have greatly enhanced his prestige. He was pardoned and his

offence was overlooked keeping in view his services in the past. He was, however, sincere to Queen Anne. Queen Anne was a fast friend of the wife of Duke of Marlborough and it was also due to his wife that he had his period of ascendancy during the days of Queen Anne.

He won his laurels during the war of Spanish succession. The British Government had taken up the cause of Austria against France which wanted to absorb the whole of Spain with all its colonies, flouting the Partition Settlement already arrived at. Duke of Marlborough was the Commander-in-Chief of the Allied forces during this war. It was on account of his able generalship that even the defeats at some places were converted into victories. He knew how to handle the forces and to infuse a spirit in them. His victories at **Blenheim**, **Ramillies**, **Oudenarde** and **Malplaquet** speak for his able direction of the forces. About him, it is said, that he never fought a battle which he did not win, nor besieged a town which he did not take.

His victories, however, were not appreciated at home. The Tory Party which, in the meanwhile, had come to power was very anxious to bring an end to the war. This over-anxiety for the stopping of the hostility did not allow England to reap the reward of its victories. The Treaty of Utrecht in comparison to the English victories was very humiliating for the English people.

Duke of Marlborough was also a master in the art of diplomacy. He was not only a soldier but he was also a politician and a diplomat. He could distinguish between a friend and a foe and he knew when to strike and when to submit. He was a pastmaster in the art of oratory, though, he could not develop a forceful writing.

It was due to his personal relations with Prince Eugene of Austria and Heinsius of Holland that England was in a position to keep in tact the grand alliance against Louis XIV of France. He was sincerely devoted to his wife. It has been rightly remarked by an English writer that this constant sincerity to his wife "ran like a thread of gold through the dark web of his career."

Sir Robert Walpole

Walpole, the greatest whig leader of the period of whig supremacy, enjoyed undisputed powers for about 21 years, from 1721 to 1742 in the English political affairs. He was the greatest of the peace ministers which England has seen. He was the first Prime Minister of England, his office though not yet recognised. He was a commoner and he always tried to grasp power through the House of Common.

He was born in 1676. After his schooling at Eton, he went to King's College for higher education. He had no taste for reading and writing and he always preferred hunting and other outdoor games over his indoor studies. He was the only son of a very rich man and he inherited vast fortunes in 1700 when his father died.

At the young age of 26 he was elected to the parliament. He was a practical man. Only after a period of six years he became the secretary for war. In spite of his hatred for reading and writing he was very succesful in his capacity as a Chancellor of Exchequer. His wonderful capacity for digesting all the Financial policies and his quick insight for understanding all their inns and outs, in spite of his dislike for desk work

surprised his colleagues. He had no love for arts. He had a keen eye for reading the characters and understanding the needs of the time. It was on account of these qualities that he became a very successful Prime Minister.

By the Treaty of Utrecht, the English had been allowed to send a trading ship to the Spanish colonies in America every year. The American wealth had always thrown a spell on the English minds. Many companies for trade with the South American regions, grew up. The **South Sea Company** was the most flourishing concern. Its prosperity, not only led to the increase of the price of its shares, but also led to the opening of many new companies for similar trade which sprang up like mushrooms in every part of the country.

There was then a financial crisis. Many companies had been opened simply to rob the people of their money. Their failure led to a general panic in the country and the people now began to sell their shares of the South Sea Company with the same impatience as they had purchased them. There were many sellers but a few buyers. This led to the failure of the big concern and the event was well described by some contemporary writers as "South Sea Bubble".

There was a fear of the ruining of several English families as a result of the failure of this company. The Whig party in power tried to tackle the situation but failed. The eyes of the nation were now fixed on Walpole as he was the only man who could save the country at this critical moment. He thus took up the responsibilities of the State and he wielded authority for twenty one years from 1721 to 1742.

Walpole restored to the share-holders of the company a part of their share by selling the properties of

the directors of the company. By this measure he relieved the situation to some extent.

Walpole has been called by some writers "**the first Prime Minister of England.**" He was actually not so. These were mere circumstances which made him enjoy the powers and the privileges now enjoyed by the Prime Ministers. It was partly due to the ignorance of George I of the English language and partly due to his disinterestedness of English affairs. George I, if had accepted the English throne, it was because he wanted to be a respectable chief in Germany and enhance the position of Hanover in the German political affairs. He did not attend the meetings of the Parliament. Walpole conducted the meetings of the Cabinet and presided over the State functions. He conveyed its decisions to the King who had been left only a signatory power. Though not in name, but in fact Walpole thus had become the Prime Minister of England.

He could not tolerate any opposition in the Cabinet and he turned out Townshend and Chesterfield when they opposed his policy. By this policy he won for himself the name of the 'Drill-sergeant of the whigs' and he gave a sufficient vent to his superiority over the other members of his cabinet. He went on enjoying these undisputed powers during the days of George I.

There was expected a change with the accession of George II as he was always opposed to his father during his life time. He was, however, handled still more tactfully and the days of George II saw the climax of the power of Walpole. George II, no doubt, was ignorant of the English language but he was interested in the English affairs. He was a man of moderate means. According to the contemporary historians he was very much under the influence of his wife Caroline. Strangely enough, she was devoted to the same

extent to Walpole. Walpole through Caroline dominated George II and enjoyed so vast powers that never a Prime Minister of 18th and 19th Century rose to that height. The cabinet system also saw a great development during this period. The powers of the House of Commons also increased to a great extent. •

Walpole maintained himself in the House of Commons by fair or foul means. According to some of the writers he used to openly assert the principles of "**Every man hath his price**" in the parliament. The others do not agree to it. They hold that he did not use the axe of bribe for all of the Members but it was for a few to whom he pointed out even within the house saying that "all these men have their price".

He was very popular in the House of Commons and his policy was generally adopted without any greater opposition during the first fifteen years of his Ministry. The admission of William Pitt and a group of young members called by Walpole "**Young Patriots**", however, broke the silence in the Parliament and led to the formation of an opposition. The last five years of his Ministry saw many uproars and heated debates in the House of Commons and it was visible that the popularity of the great minister was at its decline. The death of Caroline gave another blow to the already tottering prestige of Walpole. In 1742 when the great minister had failed to tackle **Jenkins's Ear War**, there was his defeat and an end of his Ministry.

As for his policy in the internal matters was concerned he believed in the principles of the least interference in the life of the people. He never introduced a bill which was to bring opposition of the people and if, at all there was introduced by chance some bill which brought the opposition of the public he immediately withdrew though it might be even a justified bill. He used to say "**Let sleeping dogs lie.**"

During the period of his 21 years Government which-so-ever measure he introduced none of them, with the exception of "**Excise Bill**" brought opposition. The Excise Bill was introduced and got passed from the Parliament to check the smuggling system. Many articles like Tabacco and wine were smuggled into the country and this mal-practice had so greatly increased that the Government was in a position to collect only $\frac{2}{3}$ of the expected amount from duties.

To save the Government from the loss Walpole declared that in future the required tax will be collected at the shops and after this tax the required articles will be allowed to go free of any further duties. The policy was very wise and as a result of this Excise System the Government would have not only stopped smuggling but it would have been also in a position to bring down duties on some articles and to some extent give to the people of England a bit of free trade policy.

The bill was unfortunately opposed by the people who found within its clauses, a right of the Government to go with in their shops for inspection which was considered by them highly objectionable. This policy gave undue powers to the revenue officers who were to be handy to Walpole—as the judges at a time were the 'Lions under the Crown'—in the coming elections. Walpole could not take a stand in spite of the wish of the Queen to suppress resistance with force and quietly withdrew it with the remark, 'I will not be the Minister to enforce taxes at the expense of blood.'

He did not interfere in the mode of worship of the people. Though the non-confirmitists had rendered very valuable services to him yet he failed to get any bill passed by the Parliament for the relief of their disabilities. It was due to the fear of public opposition.

He, however, by an "**Indemnity Bill**", which was passed every year by the Parliament ensured the services of the Dissenters which in normal course owing to the Test Act they could not hold.

Keeping in view the attempts made for the restoration of Pretenders which was to be sure in case of some trouble within the country the Government had been very strict for the maintenance of law and order within the country. During the days of George I, the **riot act**, was passed which banned the assembly of the people. And in case an unlawful assembly refused to disperse even at the orders of the magistrate, the latter had the authority to get them dispersed by the opening of fire.

The nefarious activities of the smugglers had become head-ache for Govt. and Walpole. He introduced "Excise Bill" but he had to withdraw it due to the opposition of the people. Smuggler, however, were punished very severely. In the city of Edinburg when a smuggler was to be hanged, a mob rallied to rescue him. The attitude of the unruly mob compelled **John Porteous**, the Captain of the city guard, to order them for dispersal. Since they defied his orders, therefore, he opened fire and some persons were killed in that firing. John Porteous was condemned to death. The Queen, Caroline who was acting regent at that time delayed his execution which infuriated the mob. Captain Porteous was dragged out of the prison house and was hanged.

When the Queen got this news she was very much infuriated and she decided to inflict a severe punishment on the people of Edinburg. She was, however, persuaded by Walpole not to resort to any rash policy because that would further aggravate the trouble and thus give a chance to the Jacobites to fish in the troubled waters. A small fine was imposed on the

people. This collection was given to the widow of the deceased as a pension.

As regards to his **Foreign policy** he believed in the principles of peace. Truly Green has appreciated his policy when he says, "Progress became material rather than political, but the material progress of the country was such as England had never seen before. He was the first and he was the most successful of our Peace Ministers." He had rightly judged the consequences of war during his times when he said, "we must be losers while it lasts, and cannot be great gainers when it ends." He always avoided a war and it was this policy of peace which greatly increased the trade and commerce and the prosperity of the country.

He was, however, not indifferent towards the European Political alliances and he tried his best to maintain the dignity of England although he always avoided complications for England. After the Death of Louis XV there was to be a rivalry between Duke of Orleans and Phillip V of Spain for the throne of France. Walpole maintained friendly relations with the duke of Orleans as the succession of Phillip V to the throne of France was to disturb the Balance of Power in Europe.

The Austrians and the Spanish people were very jealous of the growing power of England. They were after a chance to snatch back from England the concessions and territories which she had gained by the Treaty of Utrecht. They thus made an alliance by the Treaty of Vienna.

Walpole as a counter measure befriended Governments of France, Hanover and Prussia. The Spanish people besieged Gibraltar but failed. Walpole was not anxious to prolong the struggle. He came to terms by the Treaty of Seville. The Spanish people withdrew their

support as well as the recognition of Ostend East India Company, thus permitting the English to carry on trade without rivalry and also acknowledged the claim of England on Gibraltar. The English Government agreed to the authority of Don Carlos on Parma.

Walpole could not avoid a war for a long time, although he was in a position to isolate the Polish war and to say that out of the 50,000 men killed in the war there was not even a single English man. The Jenkins's Ear War spoiled his chance and gave a death blow to his already dwindling popularity.

After the war of Spanish succession the Britishers had been given the right of sending one ship of negro slaves annually to the South American colonies of Spain. They misused this privilege. The Spanish governors punished very severely the captains of the ships other than the one privileged if they found them in the Southern regions. Jenkins the Captian of a similar type of unauthorised ship was arrested and deprived of one of his ears. He returned to England with the ear cut off by the Spanish people and represented his case before the Parliament. In this, the English nation felt its great humiliation and raised great hue and cry for a war with Spain.

Walpole tried to pacify the English sentiments but failed and he had to wage a war half-heartedly. He was heard saying before the war "They may ring their bells now, but they will soon be wringing their hands." The prediction came out true as the English forces were beaten off with heavy losses and England could not gain a lot in the struggle. Walpole was charged with the thwarting and starving the war and he had to resign after a short while when his majority in the House of Commons came to three.

The chief causes of his down fall were the death of Caroline, the growing popularity of Young Patriots, the

weak foreign policy and the opposition of many great leaders to whom he had estranged by his uncompromising policy.

He was, indeed, a great man of the 18th century. In spite of his several draw-backs his achievements were unique and praise worthy.

Pitt the Elder

Born in 1708 Pitt the elder was brought up in the lap of Luxury. Educated in Oxford and Eton he contested for the English Parliament in 1735 from Old Sarum and was elected with a great majority. Pitt did not face any opposition as the number of the voters on other side was very small. Moreover the constituency of Old Sarum, which later became the most rotten borough, had been bought by his grandfather—a late Governor of Madras.

Pitt had duly watched in his own constituency the defective system of representation and corruption. He was a great idealistic and he fearlessly spoke in the Parliament against the system of representation. He could not tolerate the corrupt methods of the Whigs, though he himself had been elected as a Whig member. Caring not for the opposition he carried on his policy of criticism.

He came into the field against Walpole at a time when nobody could speak even a single word against the latter. Walpole was the greatest man of the time. As soon as William Pitt came in the political arena against Walpole many other members of the

young blood followed him. They were tired of Walpole but had not the courage to speak against him. Thus a good opposition was formed. In the beginning, the opposition appealed to a very few and Walpole contemptuously called this party as "Young Patriots". At the time of the fall of Walpole this group had become a respectable opposition in the Whig party, and during the year 1746 Pelham was compelled to include Pitt in his cabinet though, neither he nor George II, liked it.

Pitt continued to criticise the policies of Whigs in spite of his appointment as Paymaster of forces. This post was given to Pitt for ruining his career and popularity. But it brought still more popularity for him as he refused to accept any amount in form of a gift which was considered the justified income of a paymaster in those days of corruption. Pitt, thus, could not be controlled by the Whig party in power and ultimately was expelled from the Cabinet. But he went on speaking and criticising the corruptive methods of the Government with full vigour.

The Seven Year's War, at last, gave Pitt a chance to make the nation realise his worth. The English forces and the English allies were defeated every where on the globe. Newcastle, then head of the government was much disheartened and he appealed to William Pitt for a coalition. Pitt agreed and was recognised an independent supreme head of the war affairs. It seemed as if he was already well prepared for that most tedious problem. The moment he took the charge, the defeat everywhere turned into victory.

His war policy can be easily summarised in two paragraphs.

1. To blockade the seas and to let not the French people supply help of any kind to their colonies in America and other parts of the world.

2. To fortify the position of English allies in Europe with money and war material to a considerable extent.

Pitt also believed in the policy of sending immediate help to the English colonies and possessions in the world. He sent forces, money and war material to America and India at the earliest convenience. He also appointed the best men as officers in the army and believed in the theory of giving control to the young officers in stead of selecting the old drooping ones.

The English nation, which had greatly been demoralised before due to defeat after defeat on the continent, now got inspired by Pitt's forceful and revolutionary speeches. He worked day and night in order to raise the country to the height of its power. William Pitt's utterances proved prophetic and it was the settled conviction of the English that whatever Pitt said, would come to be true.

He remained as the head of English affairs so long as there was the need of a strong man to direct the war. As soon as he found that he was no longer required he resigned and made room for his successor. This shows how democratic he was. He was, in fact, a sincere nationalist and unlike Walpole, was strong and frank in his opinions.

When he found majority of Parliament hostile to his policy of declaring war against Spain he immediately resigned, though he predicted a sure war against Spain in the near future. The people misunderstood him, at that time. They did not like war against Spain as it was

injurious to the interest of the country which was already passing through an economic crisis. But events later proved that William Pitt was correct in his surmise. The war had to be declared against Spain and the credit of victory went to Pitt owing to his single-handed preparation of war. The true prediction increased his reputation and popularity to such an extent that he was considered as a terror by every party which came into power.

He successfully criticised the policy of the British Government towards the colonies. When the Colonists opposed the '**Stamp Act**' he supported their slogan of '**No taxation, without representation**'. He remarked "I rejoice, the colonists have resisted." His opposition became so strong that the Governments of Bute, Grenville and Rockingham failed one after another. George III was compelled to call William Pitt back for forming a Government though he agreed to do so rather reluctantly.

Pitt, as Prime-Minister, could not work as he desired owing to gout trouble. The disease later worsened and disabled him so much that he was unable to conduct the affairs of the Government. After two years he was obliged to resign and was given the title of **Earl of Chatham**.

For the rest of his life he remained in opposition as usual and continued criticising the policy of the Government towards the Colonists. He warned the Government of the coming danger in America and appealed to get equipped to face the American resistance. But none paid heed to it. When the war actually came the Government realised the value of his prophecy. But it was now too late.

The English masses again stressed upon the need of appointing William Pitt as the incharge of war as in

their eyes, he was the only person who could again serve the country. But Pitt now was in the declining years of his age. He tried his best to prevent the separation of the colonies from the mother country. He advised the Government not to commit to any terms which may result in the independence of the colonists.

In 1778 when he was delivering a passionate speech in the House of Lords, he fainted. There after he never recovered from his illness and breathed his last praying for the betterment of his country. His death was not only mourned by the English people living in England but moved the American colonists too.

William Pitt, the greatest commoner of the English nation, was one of those towering personalities of England who had saved their country in crisis. It would be appropriate to entitle him as a saviour of English nation. He believed in honesty at a time when corruption was the order of the day. He had a desire to reform the Parliament and to raise the moral of English people. Although he could not succeed in it yet he certainly accomplished some thing. It were only this character and principles of his that made him invincible.

As regards his principles he was born before his times. He stood for the enlightened principles and never budged an inch from his stand. He was a great orator and his speeches had a marvellous effect on the people of England. He was confident of himself and his famous declaration during the seven years war, "I know that none else but I can save the country" characterises his self confidence.

He had certain drawbacks also. He was haughty and impatient but these short-comings shade into insignificance before his other qualities. That is why, he is not only respected and loved by the English people but

is also given a place of respect in the innermost shrine of the people where history has placed only a few.

Pitt the Younger

Younger Pitt, the second son of Pitt the Elder, was born in 1759, a glorious year in the history of England owing to English victories over France in the Seven Years' War and also a lucky year for Elder Pitt who was credited for all these English victories.

Being considered lucky by his father he was greatly loved and special attention was given to his upbringing. He never went to a school and got his early education at home under the guidance of able teachers. One of the causes of his remaining indifferent to the company of friends was that he never made one in his early life.

It was during the year 1781 that he became a member of the Parliament after completing his period of an apprenticeship. Next year he was seen in the cabinet of Shelbourne as Chancellor of Exchequer and with the name and fame of his father which the people of England had fresh in their minds he got rapid promotions and by his diplomatic skill, honest life and impressive speeches he was in a position to become the Prime Minister of England in 1784 at the young age of 24 years. The chance would not have been given to him had both North and Fox not been in opposition to George III.

At his elevation to such a post of responsibility Fox remarked that the power had been given in the hands

of a school boy, little knowing, that the school boy would prove himself even the master of all the the opponents. In fact Younger Pitt though young in age was never young in experience.

He, like his father, had great confidence in himself and in face of sullen opposition he never lost his heart. He had to make his way through many obstacles again and again and no doubt he in the beginning had to seek the help of George III to face these obstacles, but he never depended too much on George III and was in a position after a few years to make a solid majority of his followers in the House of Commons.

Exactly like his father he was very honest inspite of corruption being the order of the day. He had a great desire in his mind to raise the morale of the people of England but he could not succeed much. He supported reform movements in the country just as his father did, but he never supported them so much as to endanger his own position.

He, unlike his father, followed Sir Robert Walpole at this stage and withdrew all those measures which would have brought opposition or unpopularity to him. William Pitt, when once opposed in the Parliament on the question of Spanish war, had at once resigned; but this was not the spirit of Younger Pitt. He was cleverer than his father in this respect and when once faced the opposition in the Parliament on the reform measures he immediately withdrew it.

He had not only inherited the burning enthusiasm of his father but his ability as well. If his father was an able war minister, he was an able peace minister. It was the misfortune of the English people that their foreign policy was being controlled by Younger Pitt, a good peace minister, at a time when the country

required a strong war minister. The country was facing the longest and the biggest wars of the century and was in the grip of Napoleonic wars led personally by Napoleon, one of the greatest generals of the world. Younger Pitt passionately loved his country and his nation and even at the time of his departure from this world he murmured, "Oh my country. How, I can leave you."

As for his period as a Prime Minister we can easily divide it in two parts—the period upto the French revolution and the period after its commencement *i.e.*, from 1783 to 1789 and from 1789 to 1806 respectively.

During the 1st part of his career while believing in the liberal policy, he again and again spoke for the reforms and once introduced a bill in the parliament for the abolition of the rotten boroughs even. But it was the opposition of George III, the leader of the unenlightened masses of England, and his own fear of his opponents that the matter was not taken up further.

The ministry of Fox had ended due to the defeat of his motion which he had introduced for the reform of the administration of English East India Company. Younger Pitt introduced an other measure on the same issue after making some amendments in the previous measure as there was a pressing demand for the introduction of some improvement in the Regulating Act. If Fox was defeated on this measure that was in no way due to its unsuitability but it was due to the defects of the Bill itself. The Bill was passed and was given the name of **Pitt's India Act**. The English Government by means of this Act was in a position to increase her hold on East India Company.

By **The Regulating Act** it had been declared that the Governor General in India was to rule the territories of the company with the help of his Council and he was to take for every step the approval of the majority of his council. The system failed as the decision of majority was made binding on Governor General.

The Pitt's India Act gave him over riding powers over the joint decision of his councillors. The number of the Councillors was decreased from four to three and Lord Cornwallis the next Governor General in India was made the Commander-in-chief of the Company's forces. All the appointments of British East India Company were to be made by the Directors except that of the Governor General and of one or two other high functionaries. A Board of six members was constituted in England, by the Parliament, to supervise the work of the Company and the board was supposed to inform the Parliament of all the new happenings in India. Thus a sort of dual Government was established and it continued upto the year 1858 when the British Government by the Act of 1858 took away all the supervising powers in her own hands.

Younger Pitt is remembered upto this day for his beneficial **financial Policy**. No doubt he did not originate any thing from his own brain and all of his measures were borrowed but their introduction in the Parliament and to receive its sanction was in no way a small achievement.

The economic condition of the country had deteriorated owing to the American war of Independence. No doubt the import of England was less than the export but the condition of the common masses, who due to the Industrial Revolution had been transformed from independent workers to wage earners, was very pitiable. Due to the corn duties which had been imposed by the

Government to protect English landowners from the foreign competition. The wages of the poor labourers had decreased. They were not in a position to make their both ends meet. There was a great unrest amongst them.

Younger Pitt realising their position as well as following the theory of **Adam Smith** greatly lowered the duties on the foreign imports, and in several cases he completely abolished duties and thus brought smuggling to an end. It was due to this reason that the name of Younger Pitt is mentioned in the list of those Prime Ministers who believed in **Free Trade**. He started the system of Consolidated Fund and was in a position to ensure that the expenditure in no way goes above the annual income.

The **national debt** had greatly increased due to the American war of Independence and Younger Pitt, while adopting a new theory of Sinking Fund began to save £ one million every year. He never knew the future developments and it was an irony of fate that it was during the days of Younger Pitt who tried to decrease the national debt that the debt went up in much more proportion due to the long Napoleonic Wars.

His **commercial treaty** with France was his master stroke and it on one side developed the good relations between the two countries and the trade on the other.

He was sympathetic to the **Irish people**, from the very beginning. Owing to their political religious and economic disabilities there was a great unrest in Ireland. The Irish people, when could not get any redress from the British Parliament inspite of their loyalty during the American revolution, revolted and invited the French when England and France were engaged in the Anglo French wars of the French Revolution.

The English Government suppressed the revolt with iron hand and by the **Irish Union Act of 1800** united the Parliaments of England and Ireland after allowing the Irish people to send 32 members to House of Lords and 100 members to the House of Commons. They were given some more concessions but they were not satisfied. The Irish people were not in favour of unification of the Parliaments of both the countries but they agreed because they were given many promises by Younger Pitt for removing their religious, political and economic disabilities.

Younger Pitt could not fulfil those promises due to the opposition of George III who had burst out at that time that to give concessions to the Roman Catholics was against that pledge which he took at the time of his Coronation, so no concession could be given to them. It was at this time that Younger Pitt showed the spirit of his father and when found the majority of the members opposed to him, he resigned in 1801.

As mentioned above he was not a good **foreign minister**. He believed in cheap and less risky policy. In the 1st part *i.e.*, upto 1789 the only memorable work was the **Triple alliance** concluded between England, Prussia and Holland. It saved Sweden from the aggression of Russia.

In the second phase the main event is the policy towards French Revolution. It greatly changed his policy and outlook and it changed him from a reformist or revolutionary into a reactionary to reforms. No doubt in the beginning he favoured the **French Revolution** and even encouraged people who spoke for reforms. But the Reign of Terror and the book 'Reflections on the French Revolution' by Burke changed his mind and he even became over cautious and exaggerated the danger

of the French Revolution. He stopped all sorts of meetings and even suspended the Habeas Corpus Act, the only bill, by which the English people could claim their liberty.

No doubt he was in a position to check the tide of Revolution in England because the people realising the grave danger of the French Revolution themselves co-operated with the Government-but he could not check it from spreading in Europe. He had to wage a war against the revolutionary France for a very long time and in handling this war unlike his father he failed miserably. It is correct to say that it was the misfortune of the English that during such a great national crisis the control of affairs was given to a man who was completely ignorant of these affairs.

Another important point of note was that England in that conflict was not fighting against the despotic Government of France but she was facing the whole of the French nation in arms and it would have been difficult even for William Pitt to handle the affairs had he been in this world. Younger Pitt did not realise the importance of English navy and unnecessarily wasted money by helping the European powers with money against France.

No doubt he followed his father's policy in this respect but it was not a right policy because the war was being waged against a nation which was out to destroy the existing system of Government in the world. In fact Younger Pitt was no match to Napoleon. It was the good luck of England that she remained victorious on the Seas and She also realised the importance of her naval power though at a later stage.

Younger Pitt devoted whole of his energy to win these wars for England and formed many coalitions also but the whole of his work every time was undone by

Napoleon who was always victorious on lands. While he was enjoying the victory of **Trafalgar** the heart rending news of the defeat of English allies at **Austerlitz** was conveyed to him and he died while praying for the betterment of his country.

When he learnt the allies' defeat at Austerlitz he remarked, "Roll up the map of Europe for the next ten years." This shows his prophetic insight and wisdom and it was exactly after about ten years that Napoleon was finally defeated in the battle of Waterloo in 1815, and curtain was laid over the horrible scenes of wars.

Questions

1. "He never fought a battle which he did not win, nor besieged a town which he did not take." Give an account of the career and achievements of the Duke of Marlborough in the light of the above statement.

2. How far is it true to say that Walpole's administration had no history?

Or

"Walpole's administration marks a stage in the evolution of a Cabinet Government." How? (P.U. 1951)

3. "Robert Walpole was at once the ablest and the most characteristic of the statesmen of the Whig regime." Discuss. (P.U. 1948)

4. What were the guiding principles of Walpole's administration of home affairs, and how far were they conducive to the Welfare of England?

5. Compare the achievement of Sir Robert Walpole and the Elder Pitt. Who, in your opinion, was the greater of the two statesmen? Give reasons.

(P.U. 1945 Supp.)

6. "When William Pitt said, 'I know that I can save this country and that no one else can,' he was speaking the modest truth." - (Trevelyan). Discuss this statement clearly bringing out the personal qualities and the war policy of William Pitt.

(P.U. 1941 Supp.)

7. Discuss the statement that Chatham was the first and the greatest Imperialist in English history.

8. Give a critical estimate of Younger Pitt's services as (a) statesman and (b) as Finance Minister.

CHAPTER X

IMPORTANCE OF ENGLISH SEA POWER IN THE 18TH CENTURY

It was during the days of Queen Elizabeth that the English people for the first time realized the importance of the Naval power. The defeat of Armada opened a new chapter in the history of England. The English people began to colonise in America and started companies for trade with Eastern countries. During the days of Oliver Cromwell, several concessions were gained from the Dutch people and in the opening of 18th century, England was the most important country for its Naval power. During the war of Spanish Succession, the English people defeated the French and the Spanish people and got some concessions for trade with the South American colonies of the Spanish people.

The English people became very much interested in the European struggles. They now greatly felt the necessity of building up a respectable fleet. Their safety lay on their Naval supremacy. The **Seven Years' War** which began during the days of George II had come to an end during the days of George III. The first important event of the days of George III was the realization of the importance of Naval supremacy. William Pitt at a time declared "**I know that none else but I can save the country.**" It was all because he realized the importance of the Naval Supremacy which had not been realized by any other English politician. The English people who had been facing defeats everywhere on the continent .

and abroad, saw a complete change in the events of the history with the accession of William Pitt to power. Pitt blocked all the seas and did not allow the French to send any help to their colonies in America and possessions in India. The timely help sent by the Britishers to their colonies in America and possessions in India gave them a decided advantage over their rivals and by the Treaty of Paris, they were acknowledged the undisputed masters of America and were given a free hand in trade and political activities in the East. All these victories were due to the Naval supremacy of the English.

Then began the **American War of Independence**. The British people lost this struggle. It is rather astonishing to note the complete failure of the English when only a few years back the British Supremacy had been acknowledged by all the nations of the world. If the Britishers lost struggle, it was mainly because they did not make the best use of the Naval power. The victory of the Americans is accredited to the help they got from the European Nations. England committed a blunder in not blockading the sea and thus allowing access to the European Nations. The Naval Supremacy played a very important part even within this struggle when the whole of the world was arrayed against the Britishers. If they were in a position to save Gibraltar, the key of the Mediterranean Sea, it was because of their Naval Supremacy.

There was then the **French Revolution**, the greatest event of the 18th and the 19th century. The attractive principles of **Liberty, Equality and Fraternity** got a rousing reception in every part of Europe. Napoleon, the child of French Revolution, defeated all the despotic rulers of Europe. He was victorious everywhere, but he could not bring down "the nation of the Shopkeepers", as he called the Britishers. He had a mind to capture without any difficulty. The Battle of Niles, however, frustrated all his ambi-

Questions

1. Give an account of the importance of English Sea Power during the 18th century.
2. "But for the naval supremacy England would have lost all the struggles of the days of George III". Elaborate the statement.

CHAPTER XI

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

The history of the world has seen many political revolutions. A political revolution means a complete change in the existing set up of the political structure of the state. There was a political revolution in the English History too. But as it was accomplished without any bloodshed it was given the name of the Glorious Revolution. America had similarly experienced the thrills of a revolution only a decade before the French Revolution. It will not be incorrect to say that the French Revolution was inspired by the American Revolution or the "American War of Independence" as it is popularly called.

History, even after the French Revolution, saw many revolutions. According to Mazzini, "it is always due to some all moving principle for which hundreds and thousands men fight, before which thrones totter, crowns are destroyed and created, existing ideals are shattered and new ideals break forth, and for the sake of which vast masses of people think lightly of shedding sacred human blood."

The French Revolution was the most important event of the 18th and the nineteenth century as it affected not only the history of the French but also the history of the world. The Italian war of Independence, the

Russian Revolution and the Balkans wars of Independence, were all the inspired risings of the French Revolution's watch words of 'Liberty, Equality and Fraternity'. If studied closely we will find that the French Révolution was nothing but the rising of the French depressed classes against the tyrannical rule of the French despotic kings and the undue privileges enjoyed by the French upper class.

The French people had enjoyed in the early periods some independence. They had the powers of asserting their rights. Although the provinces used to be under the Central Government, yet they enjoyed autonomy in their internal matters. The rise of the Bourbons family had deprived the people of their rights and privileges. They had been converted to the position of mere slaves. The rulers believed in the 'Divine Rights of the Kings.' They were not answerable to the people. Any criticism to their authority meant a revolt not only against their position but also to the Divine powers of Almighty.

The Kings ruled the country not for the interest of the people but for their selfish interests. It was but natural that when the king considered himself a deputy of God on earth and not a representative of the Common masses, he was never to think of their welfare. The proverb "People's voice is the voice of God" had not so far been painted in the eyes of the ruling classes. For them it was a cry of the far far future when the forces of democracy would uproot everywhere the belief of the Divine powers.

The House consisting of representatives of the French people had not been summoned for the last 175 years. The people having no voice in the administration of the state had thus no interest in it. They perhaps would not have minded this type of Government, when "Might is right" was the governing principle, if in England, only at a distance of 16 miles from the French borders,

there had been a similar type of set up. But the position there was quite different.

English parliament was necessarily to be called once during three years. The rulers there did not believe in the Divine Rights of the Kings. They believed that the Government had been given to them by the people and not by the Almighty.* The Bill of Rights had deprived them of all their powers. It would not be incorrect to say that the crown had been stripped of all its inherent powers though the king was still to sit on the same diamond throne! The French people, who had been separated from England only by a small English Channel of 16 miles, could not tolerate this great difference. This resulted in a revolution.

It was physically impossible for the French rulers to handle all their affairs of the state personally. They were to take some people into their confidence and thus in their partnership to carry on their duties of the state. The French rulers only took into confidence the rich class and the religious men of the country. They were called the upper class of the state. The poor people were never consulted. They in bewilderment got for themselves the name of the lower class.

Thus during the second half of the 18th century France was divided into two classes, upper and the lower. There was such a great difference between the two that it was impossible to imagine whether both of them had been created by the same Almighty.

The rich class had the monopoly of the Government appointments and the poor people were completely ignored. If poor people at a time deserved some concessions they were not given to them and they were left completely at the mercy of their lords. It is sad to note that the upper class neither parted with their high Governmental appointments nor did they carry on their duties which

they were supposed to do. They tried to create an impression amongst the poor people that the Government jobs were but a bed of thorns. This impression was only for a temporary period.

The upper class being in power passed such laws as were very beneficial for them but very harmful for the poor people. It is sad to note that the rich men were exempted from all the taxes and their brunt as a whole was to be borne by the poor class. The poor class people after a day long labour earned to the extent by which they could hardly make both ends meet. Tragedy lay in the fact that even from within this meagre amount, they earned by the sweat of their brow, they were deprived of a greater share by many types of taxes. They were treated so on the charge that they were not participating in shouldering the responsibilities of the State. Infact they liked to shoulder but they had not been allowed. There were many other restrictions in the country side. A poor peasant must get his corn ground from the mill of his lord. He must get his cattle butchered in the slaughter-house of his lord. He was made to pay heavily for that.

The poor wanted to raise a voice against this tyrannical and unjustified rule but were helpless. There was no 'Habeas Corpus Act', like that of England, in the French regions. By the Habeas Corpus Act every English man had been ensured his liberty. No person could be sent behind the bars without a trial and if any had been there his relatives or well-wishers could make a petition for his trial. In France there was no such guarantee of liberty. The French people were completely at the mercy of their lords and the king. The King could send any man behind the bars without showing any cause against him. Many revolutionaries, who opened their tongues for a right and protection against the tyrannical rule, found for themselves a permanent place in the jails. Souls of some of them had departed for

the next universe within the jail while the others were counting their beads in the dark dungeons of Bastille and waiting for the fateful hour with little hope to see again the sun light in their life. There was thus no question of protests.

While the poor people were being crushed under the heavy burden of the taxes, the rich men were not to pay any tax. Why should they pay a tax when they were obliging the Government by the handling of its responsibilities? They were quite ignorant from the state of affairs of the poor as will become clear from a remark of Marie Antoinette (which she made when she was told that her subject had no bread to eat). "If they cannot have any bread, why do not they eat cakes."

There was a lot of difference between the English landlords and the French upper class men. While the English landlords knew inns and outs of their subordinates and for the greater part of the year they were amongst them, the situation in France was quite different. The French landlords seldom visited the area where their subordinates lived. The poor people in France had their localities in the far flung areas where from their groans even could not reach the ears of their lords. If the lords were ignorant from the poor lot of their subordinates it was because of a class of bailiffs which they had engaged for sucking the blood of the poor people. They were a wall which separated the two colours of humanity. The bailiffs, greedy as they were, tried to take the lion share of the produce. The lords never tried to go into details. In fact they had no time for these trivial matters. They were day and night attending on the royal patron for securing high responsibilities of the state for themselves for which they were quite incompetent.

There were no connections between the rich men and the poor men. If at all the poor had any connection it was all of a rival class and an opposition and if at all they at a time remembered their lords it was with some expression of revenge and hatred. The rich men were exempted for the military service while it was compulsory in the case of the poor.

But the initiative for this revolt was not taken by the common men. History has shown that the utterly destitutes and the down trodden folks on their own initiative have never revolted against the tyrants. They have been always awakened and inspired by the lawyers, philosophers, doctors and the like. The unjustified privileges of the nobles and the tyrannical rule worked for the storing of the gunpowder in the hearts of the people. The revolutionary writings of the great men gave a life to this hidden volcano and the patience of those depressed people, who had been patiently bearing all the perverse and unjustified acts, came to an end; the dormant volcano of their self assertion erupted and there was a big blaze which scorched the despotic rule to its very foundations.

Of the many revolutionary leaders three **Montesquieu**, **Voltaire** and **Rousseau** are very important. **Montesquieu**, who had been in England for some time and who had seen a few years with a freedom loving nation wanted to infuse a similar type of spirit amongst the French people. He wanted to see in France a Government which might be of the type of the British Government. According to him Executive, Judiciary and Legislature, the three organs of the Government should be separated from one another and should work independent of one another. His great achievement was the bringing out of an encyclopedia which had within itself the complete account of the human knowledge. It was to make known to common masses of France about the world

and about their wretched condition. His writings made the French people realize the difference of the two Governments. England and France which were in actual distance not very far off but as regards their principles; the distance between the two was the same as between the North and the South Poles.

Voltaire was the second hero of the French Revolution. His poems and essays were to awaken the French nation from its deep slumber and to bring a reform in its religion which had lost its way in the high mountains of corruption and worldly life of the clergies. He considered the church as the greatest-enemy of Freedom. He was right in his point of view. The clergies had been included in the list of the upper class people. As they enjoyed all the privileges under the patronage of the despotic Bourbons they always prayed for their rule and tried to bring an end to the power of assertion amongst the people by painting the king in their eyes as the representative of God on earth. The back-ward people in the country side had a great faith in these religious leaders. In their depressed condition they approached these clergies and complained against the rulers. The clergies prevented them even from a cry and by every possible way tried to curb the spirit of freedom in the slates of their hearts which had been painted by the revolutionary leaders.

Voltaire asked the people of France to rise to break the shackles of slavery and leave aside the old customs and rejuvenate France and its culture and give liberty to themselves. Montesquieu, at a time, while making a mention of the French defeats by the British Government had held that the defeat of the former was due to the defective Government with its principles of Despotic monarch. The English won the struggle because there was a limited monarchy. Voltaire supported the view and asked the people to assert their rights to see a prosperous and respectable France.

Rousseau was the third great revolutionary leader of France. He propounded the theory of social contract and opined that the existence of the state was owing to '**Social contract**'. When the rulers were not ruling in the interest of the common people and the Government was only for a small number of individuals, the common masses have every right to break their connections with the rulers and to return to the old state of affairs *i.e.* "**State of Nature**". He was actually taking the people to the extreme revolutionary principles. The people who followed him declared that they would sacrifice their everything for their three watchwords of "**Liberty Equality and Fraternity**". In his eyes the privileged class was the robber class. When every man was born equal then why the inequality with respect to their rights in the state. The rich were robbers because they had robbed the poor of their legitimate rights of equality. The system of private property, according to him, was "legalised robbery." He further wrote that a man was born free and he must remain free, alas ! "Man was born free but is every where in chains."

These revolutionary ideas, propounded by different leaders under different colours went a long way in bringing a spirit of assertion in the minds of the French people.

An impetus to these revolutionary ideas of these philosophers was given by the American war of independence. England and France were the two rival nations in America in the race of colonising those unexplored regions. There had been a long struggle in which the English people at last came out victorious. The Treaty of Paris once for all decided that the French had no more concern with the American regions. The French no doubt agreed to that but a fire of revenge had been burning in their minds. They got a chance of avenging their past disasters when the thirteen colonies of America revolted against British Imperialism. The despotic French Government took up the cause of a nation which was fighting

for a democratic set up within its country simply for wreaking of revenge, little thinking about its consequences. The French soldiers went to America and took a very prominent part in the American struggle of Independence.

As mentioned before these were the common people who were given compulsory military training. The depressed classes of France went to America to liberate its people from a despotic Government and then returned home with flying colours. The saviours of another nation, however, greatly felt the humiliated conditions of their own nation. They wanted to liberate their people like that of America. They had the credit of their past glories and they now gave impetus to the revolutionary movement within the country with the cry "If we can liberate the Americans why not our own people."

The Irish people like the French had been a prey to the exploitation of British Imperialism. They raised a great hue and cry and got some concessions. The French got further encouragement and became ready to assert their independence even at the cost of some lives.

As there was to be a revolution in the history of France, indeed, a successful revolution, the circumstances were also turning in its favour. The French Government during the days of Louis XIV satisfied the sentiments of the French people by victories abroad. The people did not mind the payment of the taxes. The days of Louis XVI, however, were disastrous in the history of the French. They were completely beaten in the Seven Years War and they could not impress or gain anything within the American Revolution. The Government was made unpopular in the eyes of the people by Voltaire saying that the defeats of the French during the wars were due to a defective Government and not due to any deterioration of French arms.

The unpopularity of Government and the increasing dissatisfaction in the country made the king call the representatives of the people for a partnership in handling the critical affairs of the state. Thus there met after a long gap of 175 years the National Assembly, as was later on the name of the representatives of the people in the Government. It was in reality to reorganise and overhaul the state machinery which had completely deteriorated during the last several decades owing to its administration in the incompetent hands. The National Assembly had its first sitting at Versailles in May, 1789. The assembly in fact was called to help the Government but the circumstances took such a turn that it proved to be an assembly which later on brought an end to the despotic Government.

Louis XVI, the ruler of France although had invited the representatives of the people yet was never ready to share any powers with them. He wanted to keep them simply in a show case to deceive the masses of France. The national assembly was, however, not going to become a tool in the despotic hands. It wanted its rights as a representative institution of the French people. It refused to have a sitting with the privileged classes as the latter were not at all the representatives of the French people. The controversy over the question and discussion took the next two or three months. The matter was at last decided in favour of the representatives of Common people and the privileged class were to have a separate house for themselves. The king during the whole of this period with the least regards for his honourable position behaved as a tool of the privileged class. This created a suspicion in the minds of the common people about the king. The position further deteriorated when Nicker, the most popular leader of the common people was dismissed.

Since the 1st meeting of the National Assembly the king as a precautionary measure had stationed an army

in Paris to suppress rising if any within the city. The people requested the king to withdraw that army but he refused.

The suspicious people of Paris had already been burning with the fire of indignation over the dubious role of the king during the 1st discussion over the separate houses of the Common people's representatives and privileged class. The dismissal of Nicker was an act of fanning the smouldering fire. The dormant volcano of their self assertion erupted with the refusal of the king to withdraw forces from the city of Paris. There was an open revolt.

Bastille the state prison-house which had been responsible for the eating up of the several revolutionary leaders and the youth of many others was the first target. Although from the point of view of the number of prisoners within it at the time of rising it was negligible but it was well-known as a tool of tyranny in the despotic hands not only in France but also over the whole of the world. Its fall led to a universal overjoy. Even Fox the democratic leader of England could not help saying "How much the greatest event it is in the history of the world, and how much the best". The rising of the people was not restricted to the boundaries of Paris, but it also spread over the whole of the Northern France within a very short time. The common depressed class rose in revolt against their exploiters, burnt their houses and liberated themselves from those lords whose unjustified privileges had been an eyesore for them for the last several decades. The people in Paris formed new municipality and under the leadership of Lafa Yatta, National guard for the city was organised.

When the king learnt of these mishappenings he was bewildered. Finding himself in a helpless condition, he surrendered to the popular demand of the people. The

national assembly now began to attack the unjustified privileges enjoyed by the upper class. The religious laws, which were rather in a loosened condition so far, and which had been misused by the clergies were defined and the powers of the clergies restricted.

The king did not like this state of a prisoner into which he had been converted and he went to the city of Versailles. He again started those old depraved and hated practices and was again in the old company, of which he had been brought out by the National Assembly. Unfortunately for the people as well as for the King there was a famine within the city of Paris. Thousands of starving souls marched to the city of Versailles to make the king acquainted with their helpless condition. The king, however, would not listen. This led to the adoption of a policy of force by the common people, a policy which was every now and then followed after this date by the Revolutionaries to gain their end upto the execution of the king. The king was dragged to the city of Paris to see personally the lot of the depressed nationality of France.

The policy followed by the National Assembly was very bold. The members of the assembly well realised that even a single chance offered to the king would lead to their destruction. One step forward they must go on advancing without caring for the obstructions. Other wise the retrace of a single step or in other words any leniency towards the king meant the undoing of every point they gained. Thus in order to prove itself the true representative class of the common people it began to introduce such act, as brought an end to the unjust powers and privileges of the upper class. The privileges which were exclusively enjoyed by the rich class were abolished and they were equalized with those of the common people. Upto this time there was a centralized despotism. The national assembly broke down the structure by giving many concessions to the local institutions.

The common people in their respective villages and towns now enjoyed a greater share in the administration work.

Now the 'church, which had proved a great obstacle in the way of liberty, was tackled. As it had out-lived its utility and was only an instrument of recommending the tyrannical rule, its reorganisation was thought necessary. Its independence was taken away and it was brought under the Government in all the matters. It gave a death blow to the exclusive privileges enjoyed by the clergies and thus there was the end of the second upper class in the assembly.

During the Despotic regime of the Bourbons, the privileged class had been exempted from all sort of taxation. The burden of the taxes thus fell very heavily on the poor people. The assembly condemning the old system brought in a new system of taxation under which all high or low were taken into the grip of taxation and they were to pay it according to their capacity. By an other clause the power of the crown was reduced and a restricted type of monarchy as prevalent in England was declared. The king was bound to call every now and then the meetings of the National Assembly.

The king no doubt gave his consent to all these measures of the National Assembly but he was not at all sincere to his approvals. He was anxiously waiting for an opportunity when he might break all those chains of democracy into which he was being entrapped by the National Assembly. Many of his friends and courtiers had been successful in their escape to despotic kingdoms of Austria and Prussia. They were busy in enlisting the help of those despotic powers for bringing an end to the National Assembly of France and to liberate their friend, Louis XVI who had been entrapped by it.

The king once made an attempt to escape to the neighbouring despotic powers but he was unsuccessful. He was arrested when he was just going to cross the boundaries of democracy at Varennes to despotic country and was brought back to Paris where the vigilance of the national forces was made more strict on him.

Although the king outwardly reconciled, yet he was not at all satisfied with the new arrangements. He gave his consent to some of the measures passed by the assembly as a constitutional monarch but he hesitated to agree and sign those measures which directly or indirectly affected his friends who were working for his restoration to his old privileges and powers abroad.

The National Assembly declared that the French nobles by fleeing abroad, have lost their rights on their lands in France so these were being confiscated. The king would not see eye to eye with the Assembly and he refused to give his approval. The National Assembly represented to the King that the nobles who had gone to the neighbouring rulers' courts were conspiring against the new set-up in France and were thus traitors. The support of their cause would make even the king a dubious personality amongst the French masses and thus endanger his position. The king, however, would not listen to the representations of people. This greatly estranged his relations with them and precipitated the revolution.

The activities of the Austrian and Prussian Governments were very objectionable and injurious to the new set-up of the democratic France. The French Government protested to those Governments but without results. The only alternative now left with the French was to declare a war upon the despotic powers and to cripple them before they could give any harm to the French.

Government. A vote of war got the majority in the assembly and the king, when gave his approval in the matter, the war was declared.

In spite of the fact that the king gave his approval in the matter he was suspected of being in league with the enemies. The activities of the enemies had been dangerous for the National Assembly and not for the king. The king, in case of the victory of the despotic forces, was to regain all those privileges which he lost to this new set-up. The Austrians and the Prussians if at all were to attack France it was at the instigation of the French nobles, whose company the king enjoyed a few months ago and for whom he had estranged his relations with the National Assembly over the "Emigres lands." The king actually wanted to see the French forces defeated. He, however, outwardly by every possible mean, tried to convince the National Assembly that he was always praying for the French Cause and he hoped that their forces would come out successful in the struggle. The French forces, thus assured by their king, advanced to meet the invading army. They were however, defeated in the initial stages.

Duke of Brunswick, the leader of the victorious army, committed a blunder. He declared that the citizens of Paris would be dealt with very severely in case of their inflicting any harm or insult on the French king. This declaration gave a rude shock to the temporarily formed good opinion of the French people about their king. Their old belief that the king was in league with those invading forces was confirmed and they now considered French King more dangerous than even the forces which had been marching on their lands.

The French forces in a demoralized and bewildered state took up the strong step of the execution of their king

and royal family. Had the Duke of Brunswick not committed the blunder of making his declaration the execution of the king and the royal family would not have taken place. The national forces of France were not contented even after this execution and they in a desperate condition started a general destruction of all the French nobles and upper class people. '**Reign of Terror**' shocked the whole of the world. France became a republic and every national a soldier for the defence of that newly formed republic.

The strength thus gained by the so called Revolutionary forces helped them in the defeat of their enemies and the despotic forces were now seen flying for their lives. The French Revolutionary forces now declared their belief in their watch words of 'Liberty Equality and Fraternity' and made it known to all the nations of Europe that any one of them which just like the French would rise against its despotic rulers, could depend on the help of the French. This open declaration and a challenge thrown by the French people, involved them into unending wars of the European countries who made coalitions against them.

Within France the storm which had been brewing for the last so many decades over the unsatisfactory Social, Economic, Religious and Political conditions, came to its climax during the days of Louis XVI. It uprooted the despotic tree and in its stead hoisted the flag of Democracy with its watch words of 'Liberty, Equality and Fraternity'.

The following were some of the **results of the French Revolution** :—

During the last several decades the French masses had been struggling for the principles of

"Liberty, Equality and Fraternity", as put forward by Rousseau. After their success it was but natural that they were to adopt those principles. Thus it was declared that in future there would be no distinction between man and man. All were equal and the special privileges were not to be enjoyed by any class. There were to be no upper and lower classes in future. The principles of Equality gave a stimulus to the principles of Nationality amongst the French people.

The National Assembly brought an end to the despotic powers of the crown. The common man so far had no voice in the affairs of the state. The revolution asserted the new principles of sovereignty of the people and France became a Democratic State. By removing the special privileges upto this time enjoyed by the French upper class, the Revolution gave to the people of France the power of self-assertion.

Napoleon Bonaparte

History of the world has witnessed only a few generals as great as Napoleon. He lived and died for France. But unfortunately the latter did not respond properly to his zeal and this lack of enthusiasm in the French people brought about his tragic end.

Born and brought up at Ajaccio in the small state of Corsica, he showed the marks of a resolute and determined spirit from his very early life. There seldom passed a day when the complaints were not made against him. He was not the only son of his father.

His father did not love him. It was because of his mother **Madame Mere** that he lived with his parents for quite a long time. She never discouraged him. No body could at that time dream, that he would one day become one of the greatest men of his times.

Recruitment for the armed forces in his state, gave him a chance to enter into army. His parents did not hinder him in his plan. He went to Paris. After completing the training period, short statured Napoleon was posted in the city of Paris as a Second Lieut. He was hardly of thirty years age when French Revolution began. It offered an opportunity to restless Napoleon to rise.

Josephine, whom Napoleon married later on, introduced him to her father who was a Minister of France. The romance with Josephine not only brought a revolution in Napoleon's mind, but also in his life.

He was a daring man and it was not difficult for him to get promotion and distinction, if some one could patronise him. He was posted on the Northern borders of France in order to prevent landing of an English force. The batteries of Bonaparte created a great confusion and havoc in the English flanks and they thought it better to retire to their country for safety. He was properly rewarded for devotion to his duty and he was given a higher appointment. He was then despatched to Italy to liberate her people from Austria, Pope and the other despotic powers. He was best fitted for this commission.

He found, the Italians ready to utilize his services and he, following a new system of sudden attacks, so greatly harrassed the Austrians that they began to

follow a policy of hasty retreat and within a few days they were out of the Italian regions. Napoleon was very anxious to see Pope—the head of the Roman Catholics—so he advanced towards Rome, but found the city deserted by Pope and his followers.

Napoleon returned to France. He was now the most popular general. He wished to attack England and to subjugate the 'nation of the shopkeepers', as he called them. He could not fulfil his dream owing to English supremacy on the waters. He was, however, a man who never gave way to despair and he chalked out another plan more daring than even the first i.e., the conquest of British possessions in the East.

He set out on his mission at the head of a grand army which had seen nothing but victory. Beginning was quite encouraging. He defeated the Egyptians and occupied large part of Egypt. He now planned to march to India where the French ally, Tipu, was anxiously waiting for help. The dreams of Napoleon were dashed to the ground because **Nelson**, the English admiral, who had won laurels on the waters, if Napoleon had done so on the land, completely destroyed the French fleet in the **Battle of the Nile**. Napoleon had been taken by surprise as he had never expected the English to be so active.

He, now tried to reach India through land and besieged Acre. The Turkish soldiers offered stout resistance with the help of an English force under Smith and compelled Napoleon to raise siege and return to Egypt. In Egypt, however, another trouble was waiting for him. The Egyptians had been greatly encouraged by the failure of Napoleon at **Acre**. They opposed him but were again defeated.

The battle of Nile was, indeed, a very important battle. It not only shattered the dreams of Napoleon of reaching Indja but also broke the invincibility of Napoleon. Encouraged by the defeat of Napoleon, European nations again decided to settle matters with the French with the help of the English.

Discouraging reports from France were pouring in every day and these greatly vexed the mind of Napoleon. In his absence the French had been defeated in Italy and England, Austria, Russia and Turkey had formed a coalition to bring about an end of the French Republic.

Napoleon, "a child of revolution," could never tolerate it and after appointing Klüber in command of his army in Egypt he stole back to France. The country was more in need of a general than of the army. After his return he by a coup d'état of Brumaire seized power and after bringing about an end of Directory himself became the first Consul. His presence raised fresh hopes in the minds of the French people.

Napoleon again led French forces into Italy which had been usurped by the Austrians in his absence. The battle of **Marengo** decided the issue in favour of France and the Austrians silently retreated to their country. Next struggle was fought at **Hohenlinden** in which the Austrians were completely routed and were compelled to kiss the threshold of French court. **Treaty of Luneville** was signed by which the French received all the territories situated on the left bank of the Rhine.

The Austrians recognised the republics of Cisalpine, Batavian and Helvetian which had been created by

Republican France. Russian Czar withdrew from the coalition either owing to the weak and vacillating policy of the Allies towards France or to his personal admiration for Napoleon and thus deserted the Allies at this critical juncture.

Russian policy thus deprived the English of their last supporter on the continent. Thus the second coalition came to an end.

Most of the European nations now began to follow a policy of favouring France. They realised that they were unnecessarily taking up the cause of the English, without personal enmity with France. The victories of Napoleon, secondly, had harrassed them. In order to save their skin, it was necessary for them to be neutral. The English harrassed them on the waters as they searched every ship even if it belonged to a neutral country. As a protest, the Russians in league with Sweden and Denmark, declared a policy of **Armed Neutrality**. When the English came to know of this league they were very much perplexed but their admiral proved himself equal to the occasion. He bombarded the port of Copenhagen and completely destroyed the Danish fleet before it could be used by the enemies. Death of Russian Czar further relieved the situation. New Czar was inclined more towards England.

There was a time when Napoleon after his return from Egypt was anxious for peace but the English had rejected the proposal with a taunt saying that peace could only be restored in case the old Bourbon family was restored to the throne. After the victory of Napoleon over the Austrians the eyes of the English were opened and now they were anxious for peace. The English had seen that they could not oppose the French

on the land, whereas the French had realised that it was not possible for them to defeat the English on the waters. The struggle between the two came to an end by the **Treaty of Amiens**. When we study the treaty we come to know that the English anxiety for peace was much greater than that of the French and it will not be incorrect to say that they begged for peace.

Following were the terms of the treaty.

1. They acknowledged the French Government with Napoleon as its Emperor and thus in a way recognised the supremacy of the French on land.
2. Napoleon agreed to liberate Naples and the Papal State and the English, in return, promised complete liberty to the Knights of St. John.

Peace was appreciated both in England and France, as both the sides were tired of war. But settlement was for a very short time as Napoleon had agreed to it, only to give rest to his exhausted soldiers and to reorganise the administration of the State. Within a year of the settlement complaints after complaints were made to the British Government, by the French Emperor as the latter wanted to find justification for war, which he was going to begin shortly.

He insulted the English Ambassador at Paris as the English had not vacated the island of Malta though they promised to do so. The war was renewed and Napoleon worked day and night for the subjugation of the 'Nation of the shopkeepers', which had not submitted so

far. French fleets at Toulon and Brest waited for a chance to run through the English blockade of Cornwallis or Nelson. **Villeneuve**, the French admiral of Toulon was successful in his attempt and he made a show of invading the West Indies although his main target was England. **Nelson** was not a man who could be deceived easily. The two forces met at **Finisterre** and the French fleet unable to face the charge was compelled to take shelter at Cadiz, and it could not land in England—its main goal.

Napoleon rebuked his admiral, calling him a coward. This was enough for a man like Villeneuve who immediately went into the open seas to save his face without caring for the consequences. The French fleet was routed by Nelson, in the battle of **Trafalgar** although he himself was killed.

Napoleon knew the coming events, but he was ready to meet the national disgrace. In spite of the fact, that his dreams of complete domination over England had been shattered in the seas he did not accept defeat. In fact it brought new vigour in him. He had already moved his forces against Austria and Russia. He correctly estimated them to be the future friends of England. Then was fought a **battle of Austerlitz** which was in no way inferior in its importance to the battle of Trafalgar. Napoleon had avenged his defeat in it and it was now clear to the world that if the seas were for the Britishers, definitely land was for Napoleon.

The policy of Napoleon towards the European states from this date onward was quite different. He was no more fighting for the revolutionary ideas. Napoleon had become the dictator as Burke had predicted in his "reflections on the French revolution." He not only established a dictatorial government in France but he wanted

to see similar governments established in the whole of Europe under his brothers who were unfortunately many.

After the Austrians' defeat they were given very unwise terms. They were to pay a war indemnity of 40,00,00,00 francs by the **Treaty of Presburg** and they were compelled to recognise the independence of Electors of Bavaria and Wurtemberg. After driving the Bourbons out he appointed his brother Joseph Bonaparte the ruler of Naples. He himself received the title of an Italian King and forced his brother Louis Bonaparte upon the people of Holland as their King. A confederacy of German States was formed under his own protection and this step was highly disliked by the Prussians who found their own interests in danger.

The main object of Napoleon was to be the supreme master of Europe and to cow down the English who had always avoided his yoke owing to their supremacy on the waters.

The Prussians were also defeated in the **battle of Jena** and Napoleon entered Berlin triumphantly. Napoleon at this time was at the height of his power. From the city of Berlin he issued his orders which have been called '**Berlin Decree**'. By these orders he forbade all those nations friendly to France to carry on trade with England. Similar orders were issued from Milan.

Napoleon hoped of a victory over England by bringing about the economic starvation of the English people; **Continental System** was followed by France, Italy, Spain, Switzerland, Holland and the confederation of

Rhine. Austria and Prussia also agreed to it after some time Napoleon was now planning to close other European ports for the English goods which had not so far stopped their trade with the latter, as they were ports of independent countries.

Russia was the most important of those countries. Relations with Russia had already been estranged and the refusal of its ruler to accept that system led to the war. The Russians were expecting support from England in case of a war with Napoleon but no help came from England and after their defeat at Friedland in 1807 they were compelled to come to terms by the Treaty of Tilsit. Czar Alexander agreed to accept all those changes which had been brought about in Europe by Napoleon. By a secret article he agreed to enforce Continental System in Russia. He promised to support its enforcement in Denmark, Sweden and Portugal as well.

The British Government in no way was ignorant of these activities of Napoleon. By a declaration it warned all those nations of Europe which were friendly to France that they would not be allowed to carry on trade with other parts of the world and their ships whenever found in the seas, would be captured. The British naval forces after bombarding Copenhagen destroyed the Danish Fleet before it could take up the cause of Napoleon.

The people of Europe suffered greatly owing to the Continental System and the prices of all the articles went very high. England was also, no doubt, hit hard but the people of Europe suffered more than those of England. Portugal, whose prosperity depended wholly on trade, was the first country to defy the ordinances of

Napoleon. Napoleon immediately despatched his forces to tame its people. But next year, he committed the biggest blunder of his life when he appointed his brother Joseph the ruler of Spain.

Spain was an independent nation. As an old ally of Napoleon it had patiently suffered the losses brought about by Berlin decrees. The appointment of Joseph meant its enslavement. The whole of Spain was in open revolt and in spite of the personal attempt of Napoleon it could never again be reconciled or subjugated. The British Government fully exploited the situation and sent forces to help the people of these countries. This led to a prolonged struggle which ultimately brought about the downfall of Napoleon.

Russian trade was completely ruined due to the Continental System. So the Czar was compelled to defy Napoleon. Napoleon himself was not on good terms with Czar. The Czar had refused to marry his sister with Napoleon, when the latter had divorced Josephine—the maker of his life—and was planning to marry some princess in order to have a son, who could be the legitimate ruler of France after him; Czars' refusal to enforce continental laws led to the war.

Napoleon at the head of a grand army of six lakhs attacked Russia little realising that he was fighting with a nation. The Russians followed a policy of retreat and withdrew as far as their capital Moscow. They took a stand for their capital at **Borodino** and "the bloodiest battle of the century was fought in which both the sides lost nearly about 40,000 men each."

Napoleon entered Moscow after a week but found it a ruined city. He realised the determination of the

Russians and in a disappointed mood started for the return journey. The return journey was terrible indeed. The cold of winter and pursuit of the Russians reduced the grand army of six Lakhs which had entered Russia six months ago only to 60,000 soldiers; 20,000 according to an other estimate.

Napoleon was defeated in the **battle of Nations** and when after his escape to France he found the gates of Paris closed for him he abdicated and became the ruler of **Elba**, a small island near Italy.

The European nations were busy in their rehabilitation and thought that Napoleon would now sit calm for the rest of his life at Elba. But a man who had once remarked "**I was able ere I saw Elba**", and who once had been the dictator of Europe was not going to be contented with that type of life. He was waiting for a chance and the chance came very soon when everywhere in France there was dissatisfaction owing to a weak successor of Napoleon.

French people had seen glorious days and sentimental as they were, they wanted to have Napoleon back who might again show them the way to victory. Napoleon landed in France at **Cannes** and Marshal Ney, who was sent to capture him and bring him to Paris in an iron cage before Louis, joined him. Napoleon again became the ruler of France and Louis fled away for his life.

Napoleon, with in a short time, was able to organise an army of about 1,50,000 strong. The nations of Europe, setting aside all their disputes, joined together.

to bring the menace of Napoleon to an end. Napoleon promised not to be an aggressor again. But they refused to acknowledge him the legitimate ruler of France. Napoleon was compelled to take up arms in his defence.

He ruled France for a short period of 100 days only and his defeat in the **battle of waterloo** in 1815, convinced him, that the days of his rule, in fact, were over. He was arrested and deported to St. Helena where he passed the last six years of his life, writing his memoirs and quarrelling with the British Governor of the place.

He died in 1821 and the two last words which he uttered were, "Josephine and France." He lies buried in Paris amongst the other great personalities of France.

In spite of all his drawbacks and the fact that during the later years of his life he had become an unprincipled and a rude man he was one of the greatest generals of the world.

The Battle of the Nile

Bonaparte after defeating the Austrians in Italy returned to France. He had now a mind to humiliate 'the Nation of the Shop-Keepers', the name as given to the Britishers by him. With the idea in view he planned an attack of England. The scheme, however, failed because of the British supremacy on the waters. He then thought of giving a blow to the British prestige abroad. An attack on its Eastern possessions in India

was thus planned. The times were also very favourable. Tipu, the Sultan of Mysore, had been a sworn enemy of the Britishers and he invited the French to his aid. Bonaparte started for the East. He captured the island of Malta in Mediterranean sea and after defeating the Egyptians in the Battle of Pyramids established himself in Egypt as well.

He had been always successful in his designs by the time. This had turned his head a bit. He was enjoying his victories quite ignorant of the approach of the British Navy when Nelson unexpectedly appeared in the waters of the Nile. He defeated the French in the battle of Nile and completely destroyed their fleet.

The battle of Nile is very important in the history of Europe. It dashed to the ground Napoleon's dream of reaching India and made Tipu helpless in the coming struggle against the Britishers. The British empire in the East thus became safe from the immediate aggression for some time. The British victory at Nile not only saved India but it also led to the recovery of the British prestige which had been greatly lowered by the victories of Napoleon in all the fields. The defeat at Nile compelled the French General to make a bid of going via land to India. When even this bold scheme failed, he had no other alternative than to leave his forces where so ever they were in Egypt and himself steal back to France.

The victory of Britishers in the battle of Nile also led to the formation of a Second Coalition which had

England, Russia, Austria, Turkey and Naples its members.

Battle of Trafalgar

Another important naval battle of the Anglo—French war was the Battle of Trafalgar. Napoleon, when failed in his attempts towards the East, tried to destroy the very basis of supply and power. He planned and attempted an invasion of England. The French fleet at Toulon and Brest was anxious to steal through the blockade of the English to England. Napoleon with his forces was encamping in the Northern parts of France at Boulogne waiting for an opportunity to break the cordon of Britishers. He would not have taken this strong step but for the fact that he had begun thinking England as the main power for all those coalitions which were organised in Europe against his authority. Lord Cornwallis and Nelson the British Commanders of the two fleets on their side were not less alert. It was a question of the existence and liberty of the English nation and England never before since the attack of Spanish Armada had seen so critical a time. The English were, however, too confident of their Naval Supremacy and that becomes clear from a remark of the British Naval Commander; "I do not say that the French can not come but I dare say that they can not come via sea."

Napoleon had also the support of the Spanish fleet at this hour when there was the question of his honour. The French fleet at last got a chance and it set sail for West Indies to see the English off their guard and then to return with all haste to transport French forces of Napoleon to England. For a moment he outwitted the British Naval Commander, Lord Nelson, but the

latter became conscious of the actual designs of the French and he was now determined to prevent them from the transportation of their armies to England. The French fleet was overtaken and compelled to take shelter at Cadiz. It was unfortunately at this critical time that Napoleon rebuked Villeneuve, his naval commander for his cowardice. The latter could not tolerate this insult. Little caring for the consequences he went into the open sea to engage the Britishers.

The results were not very far off to seek. Napoleon realizing the situation had already started for the East against Austria and Russia, the future friends of England. Villeneuve, the French desperate naval commander engaged Nelson off Trafalgar. Nelson was given a signal not to engage the French. He was, however, also a very determined soldier. He was not going to lose the opportunity, once offered, to test his strength with the French and thus to add one more gem of victory to the already victorious crown of his master, George III.

The battle was decisive and as had been predicted by Napoleon the French fleet was destroyed. The English loss was also too heavy. Lord Nelson their naval commander, himself lay dead in the struggle. The victory dashed to the ground, the second cherished dream of Napoleon—the dream of humiliating “The Nation of the shop-keepers.” He had been once heard saying, “If we are the masters of this small English Channel for six hours we will be the masters of the world.” Alas! he could never control the 16 miles English Channel even for this small time.

The victory of Trafalgar once for all removed the danger of the French aggression and the English who had known no peace for the last several months at last

had a peaceful time. It once for all decided that the seas were meant for the English. It was a struggle of their existence and liberty. It led to the formation of the Third Coalition. The British supremacy thus achieved on the waters helped them a lot in their struggles against the French in Spain and Portugal.

Battle of Austerlitz

Napoleon had well realized that the naval struggle against England was not to end in his favour. He moved from Boulogne with his forces against the Austrians and the Russians whom he counted amongst his great European rivals after his naval disaster.

When he got the news of the French disaster at Trafalgar he was the least disturbed as he had already known the results of the war since the day his plans were miscarried by Villeneuve, his naval commander. In the rejoicing of Younger Pitt after the British victory at Trafalgar he found the short-sightedness of the British Prime Minister.

A day before the Battle of Trafalgar Napoleon had compelled the Austrian thirty thousand army to surrender at Ulm while he had started on the pursuit of the rest of the army which had escaped to join the Russians. Napoleon had been defeated on the waters but on land he was still invincible and had to his credit a long record of victories.

He engaged the combined army of the Austrians and Russians at Austerlitz and completely scattered them.

This was the most important of the victories of Napoleon—a victory which was pregnant with many European problems. It once for all decided that if the English were the master of the sea, Napoleon was an undisputed master on the land.

This victory also broke down the Third Coalition and compelled the Russians and the Austrians to kiss the threshold of the court of Napoleon. Younger Pitt, when heard of this victory, sank to the grave. Before his death he had remarked, "Roll-up the map of Europe, it will not be wanted these ten years." He perhaps meant to say that for the next ten years there was no question of a rivalry with Napoleon on the Continent.

Continental System

Napoleon was determined to humiliate 'The Nation of the shop-keepers'. The Battles of Nile and Trafalgar dashed to the ground all his cherished dreams and ambitions. Like a desperate man he planned out another scheme to bring them down to humiliation by closing the ports of Europe to their goods.

If the Battles of Nile and Trafalgar sounded the supremacy of the British Nation on the waters the Battles of Austerlitz and Jena made it crystal clear that Napoleon was an undisputed dictator of Europe. After the victory of Jena Napoleon found whole of Europe at his feet. A struggle now began between the two nations, one supreme on water and the other on land, for supremacy. Both had a mind to humiliate their rival power. A struggle lay between the land and the sea and it was

to be seen which one of the two had more importance.

Napoleon by the Berlin and Milan decrees commanded to all the European nations subordinate or friendly to him not to have any trade with the British people. Russia, Prussia, Austria, Spain and the other nations promised Napoleon that they would go by his command. As the decrees concerned the whole of European Continent, the system became known as "Continental System".

These days were very critical in the History of England. If Napoleon had availed of every power at his disposal to harm the interest of England, the latter was not going to spare the former and it was naturally to use all its powers to counteract designs of Napoleon as well as to retaliate with a still greater fury.

By a series of orders in Council Castlereagh retaliated and declared that all those nations of Europe which would co-operate with the French Government and would thus close their ports to the English goods would be considered as enemies and their ships would be destroyed when-so-ever seen on the waters.

It is true that the British nation had to suffer a lot as a result of this Continental System but the sufferings of the Europeans were in no way lesser than that of the Britishers. The Britishers had blockaded all the European ports and when the Europeans could not import any article from abroad there was a great scarcity of articles within those countries. The prices of the articles went very high and with that there began smuggling of the British articles.

The Britishers earned a lot out of this trade. There was now great discontentment in every part of Europe with the rise of the prices of the articles. People questioned one another about the cause of that rise and there was the reply, "Continental System."

The system led to a great unpopularity of Napoleon. Had the system been successful and the nations of Europe co-operated, England would have definitely been brought to its knees. Unfortunately it would not happen.

Portugal was the first country to refuse to go by the clauses of the Continental System. It was a country, the majority of whose people wholly depended on the trade. For them sea was more important than the land. Napoleon marched upon the country to punish the Portuguese. The English were, however, not blind to the call. They took up the cause of the Portuguese.

Russia next refused to comply with the clauses of the Continental System. This led to a war with even Russia. Napoleon could not control the situation and tumbled down before the pressure of the people. He had a mind to bring down the British people by his Continental System but unfortunately he could not and he himself came to his knees. Continental System was one of the chief causes of his unpopularity and downfall.

Peninsular War

Napoleon after his victories at Austerlitz and Jena had become the dictator of Europe. He had tried to

bring down the "nation of the Shopkeepers," but had failed and the naval battle of Trafalgar once for all decided that by force he could not humiliate the Britishers. He was, however, determined to humiliate them and he now tried to starve the Britishers by closing all the ports of Europe for trade. This policy was called "the Continental System."

Portugal refused to introduce the Continental System and sent back a very evasive reply to Napoleon when he asked her to close her ports—just like the other European countries had done—to the British goods. Portugal was justified. Trade was the chief source of income of its people. Its people considered the power of water more important for them than the power of land. They thus drifted more towards England, although the latter unfortunately did not bother much for the former.

Napoleon—realising Portugal as a dangerous rival—conspired against her with the Spanish King, Charls IV. The Czar of Russia had already been befriended by the treaty of Tilsit and Napoleon now sent his forces under Junot to occupy Portugal. The Spanish people had been assured some slice in their colonies and thus they also co-operated. The ruler of Portugal fled away to his colonies of Brazil and the English thus lost their last friend on the continent.

Napoleon was a very ambitious man. Not to talk of partitioning the empire of Portugal with the Spanish people he was even thinking in terms of capturing Spain and its colonies. He had already increased the number of his forces in Portugal and had also occupied some strategic places with Spain.

their transporting of armies would be borne by the English. These were very lenient terms and these led to the explanations of the British generals in Portugal. They were recalled and Sir John Moore was appointed the head of the British occupational forces of Portugal. Sir John Moore advanced towards Spain to liberate it from the French forces, in the same way.

When Napoleon learnt of the French defeats and the other mishappenings within Spain he was very much annoyed and he personally marched to that country to destroy all opposition to the rule of his brother. He defeated the Spanish forces in many engagements and treated them very cruelly. Sir John Moore tried to cut the supplies of Napoleon with his capital city of Paris, but failed. By this act, he invited against himself the whole of the might of Napoleon.

Napoleon advanced towards Sir John Moore and the two great generals met in the battle of **Corunna**. Sir John Moore was killed in the struggle. Napoleon was obliged to leave the work of pursuit to Marshal Soulte as he himself had to return to Paris for organising action to combat the Austrian rising.

Sir Arthur Wellesley succeeded Sir John Moore and in the initial stages restricted his activities only to the borders of Portugal. He—within the period before another war broke with the French—organised his army and built strong walls from Lisbon, the Capital of Portugal, to the Sea. These walls later on helped him a lot during his struggles with the French. He won a decisive victory over the French at **Talavera**. Marshal Soulte tried to break through the English cordon but failed.

Massena—another great general of Napoleon—was next sent to break down the resistance of the British general—Sir Arthur Wellesley, now viscount Wellington—and to turn him out of the Continent bag and baggage.

Massena won some victories and was successful in his attempt to turn out the Britishers from Spain. But he could not be successful in Portugal where the British general had a long line of fortification. Thus, Massena also failed.

Napoleon in the meanwhile had engaged himself in death-grip with the Russians, when the Czar of Russia refused to go by the clauses of the Continental System. Viscount Wellington got his chance and he renewed his struggle with the French people. In the battle of **Salamanca** he defeated the French and entered Madrid, the capital of Spain, with his victorious army.

Events were thus changing against Napoleon in Europe. He had no doubt, entered Moscow with his victorious army simultaneously, but he, unlike Wellington, could not rejoice his victory. While Wellington was welcomed by the depressed population of Madrid, Napoleon got a reception from the burning houses of Moscow, which perhaps were there to bask for a moment against the terrible winter of Russia!

Wellington defeated Joseph—the elder brother of Napoleon, who was also the ruler of Spain—in the battle of **Vittoria**. It was one of the most important battles of the century. It brought an end to the despotic rule in Spain. It once for all decided the supremacy of the people over a despotic ruler. It proved beyond doubt

that the forces of despotism cannot keep down the national spirit of a country. The loss of the French within the struggle was too heavy and they never again opposed the Spanish forces in the Spanish lands. All the rest of the engagements in the Peninsular War were simply to complete the work which was near its completion. Quite the same was the position of Napoleon when he was fleeing away from Russia in a terrible winter, pursued by the Russians.

The French took their last stand at **Toulouse**. In this struggle they fought very desperately and although they were defeated yet the loss of the victors was far greater than that of the vanquished. Spain was liberated and thus a struggle, which had started five years earlier, ended in a victory of the national forces over the foreign despotic rule.

Napoleon "a Child of Revolution" had been so much blinded by his ambitions that he had totally forgotten the principles of "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity." His over-ambitious policy turned the Spaniards from his best supporters into his great enemies. He could not distinguish between a respectable nation, like Spain, and a depressed nation, like Italy which had ceased to be called a nation and drove them both with the same rod: the result was a tragedy. He was later on heard saying "**Spanish ulcer has ruined me.**" It was a true confession, as the Spanish struggle had drained his resources and had placed him under many handicaps after his return from Russia, when he sorely needed men and material for retrieving his lost position.

Battle of Waterloo

Napoleon after his defeat in the Battle of Nations abdicated from the French throne and was sent to a small island of Elba as its chief. The Nations of Europe were now involved in the most tedious job of the re-arrangement of the boundaries of the different countries of Europe. They many a time were drawn against one another.

The restored Bourbon King Louis XVIII neither had the passion of war like Napoleon nor was he a patron of the Revolutionary ideas of 'Liberty, Equality and Fraternity.' He was in favour of the old despotic principles and he restored the property of all those French nobles who had escaped to the neighbouring countries before the beginning of the revolution. This estranged the relations of the French ruler with his subjects. Napoleon was desired back by the Nation.

Napoleon availed himself of the opportunity and landed in France at the head of one thousand soldiers which he had organised while at Elba. The French army sent to arrest him and to bring him a prisoner with in a cage, specially got constructed for the purpose, joined him and thus helped him in his restoration to the French throne.

He was not that old ambitious Napoleon, when he heard that the European nations were determined to pull him down and had declared him an enemy of European peace, he immediately sent a message that he had no more a mind to disturb the peace of Europe and he wanted to rule in France peacefully.

The Nations, however, would not agree. They buried their mutual grievances and moved their forces to restore Louis XVIII to the throne of France. Realizing that Belgium would be the first target of Napoleon the Prussians and the English forces moved into Belgium to obstruct the advance of Napoleon.

Napoleon also made haste to meet them as he had a mind to scatter them before they could get any support from the Russians and the Austrians. General Grouchy was despatched against Blucher, the Prussian General while Marshall Ney was commanded to engage the British forces led by Duke of Wellington. Grouchy defeated the Prussians at **Ligny** and **Quatre Bras** but he could not crush them.

The Prussians would not go to Namur as had been estimated by Napoleon but they retired to Wavre from where they had a plan to go to Waterloo, the appointed place with the British general Wellington. Napoleon was warned about the future combination of the English and the Prussians but he scorned the idea. He was so over-confident of his success that he would not listen to any suggestion which might in any way speak for the strength of the enemies.

The French army after seven hours offensive warfare failed to break down the resistance of the British forces at Waterloo. The British forces were now joined by the Prussians and Napoleon after a desperate attack left the battlefield for France. He found the gates of the city closed at him. He tried to escape to America but failed and he passed the rest days of his life at St. Helena as a British prisoner.

The battle of Waterloo once for all ended the long period of Napoleonic Wars. Europe got back peace. The ideas of 'Liberty, Equality and Fraternity' failed to influence Europe. It had again the despotic rulers at the helm of its affairs. The 'Holy League' of the European nations formed by Russia made it clear that the voice for Democracy was still a cry in the wilderness.

French Revolution and England

France and England had been hostile to each other for the last five centuries over one question or another. They were rivals in America and India over the respective questions of colonisation and trade in the 18th century. The American revolution had recently ended successfully. The two countries being great rivals, changes in one country were bound to affect the history of the other.

The two countries which were separated by a small English channel of 16 miles differed a lot as regards their political out-look. While in England since the Glorious Revolution of 1688 there had been established a constitutional monarchy, in France there was still lingering on unpopular despotic regime.

Montesquieu, a French leader, visited England and took away to his country the germs of constitutional monarchy. Voltaire and Rousseau further inspired the down-trodden classes while the successful American Revolution erupted their hidden volcano of self-assertion and they rose to an open revolt against the tyrannical rule.

In its initial stages the French rising was seen in England with an indifferent eye. It was because the English people were too much absorbed in their internal problems. For them it was just like a domestic affair of France having little concern with the outer-world.

The fall of Bastille was, however, a turning point as regards the English opinion towards the French Revolution. There were comments and opinions forth-coming from every nook and corner of England. It seemed as if the fall of Bastille had made even the rich men of England open their eyes and see the world around them. It gave a chance to the lovers of liberty to enjoy its bliss for a moment. Bastille had a negligible number of prisoners at the time of its fall. But it was well known over the whole of the world as a tool of tyranny in the despotic hands, responsible for the eating up of the several revolutionary leaders. Hence there was a universal joy at the news of its fall.

Some of the English people rejoiced at the event because of their selfish interests. France was a traditional enemy of England. When ever it was free from its internal troubles and prosperous it thought of an aggression over England or its possessions abroad. During the period of its present internal trouble English safety was assured. The English people were thus now to be free from the heavy taxation of their Government which it was to impose in case of a struggle with the French.

Fox a great Whig leader, however, took the movement in France in quite a different colour. For him in the revolution there lay the germs of a future constitutional Government like that of England, which it had gained after the Glorious Revolution. He hailed every

change within the French affairs which was to deprive the crown of some of its despotic privileges. When he came to know of the fall of Bastille he exclaimed with joy "How much is this the greatest event that has ever happened in the world, and how much the best!"

Fox even asked the English people to co-operate with the revolution as its ultimate goal lay in a constitutional Government like that of England. In case of a constitutional Government in France as well, both the countries would come more near each other. They even might make a grand defence for constitutional principles in the European political squabbles against the despots of Eastern Europe.

The democratic people of England rejoiced at the fall of Bastille more than any other group of the English people. The consequences of the fall of Bastille and the end of the despotic rule, as they well imagined, were to be the beginning of a progressive rule with its enlightened principles, so they were very happy at the prospects of a democratic France.

Societies were started in England to give a stimulus to the revolutionary ideas and to create an understanding of similar principles within the country. These societies brought the two countries nearer each other. Never in England before or afterwards there was seen so much agitation for the reforms as during this period.

While in every part of England the societies were carrying on propaganda for revolutionary ideas, Younger Pitt, quite indifferent towards their movement, was seen too much absorbed in his financial policy. He was

planning a policy by which the national debt might be brought down. The only possible way was to keep England out of European complications and thus of war. Peace was the main object of the policy of Younger Pitt. He favoured the revolutionary ideas—simply because these were to bring an end of a despotic regime and with it a policy of aggression towards England. Thus in the beginning the policy of Younger Pitt towards the Revolution if not patronising was also not reactionary.

His policy, however, took a turn and became more and more partonising during the coming period although it was for a short time. His sympathies with the revolutionary ideas gave a great impetus to the movement. Societies for the spread of similar principles in England were started. Agitations for the reform of the parliament were at their full swing and England never before or afterwards experienced such a thrill of demonstrations for the furthering of democratic cause within the country.

Burke, the greatest thinker of the time saw the movement in quite different colours. Although he was a Whig yet he opposed it and warned the people not to patronise it. He wrote his "Reflections on the French Revolution" wherein he tried to prove that as the party leading the French Revolution had its destructive principles it was bound to fail and there was definitely to come a period of terror in the history of France where life and property of no body would be safe. Taking advantage of this disturbed and ruined condition there was then bound to emerge a dictatorial Government within France. It would also affect the country adjacent to France. He thus asked the English to boycott the movement. "Fly away from the French Revolution" was his famous remark.

The sound of warning affected a few people in the beginning, but the change of events in France as

predicted by Burke changed the people's view also to the principles propounded by him. The "Reign of Terror" which followed the disturbance in France shocked the whole world. The execution of the royal family and destruction of rich men perplexed the English as also their Prime Minister Younger Pitt and King George III. They now realised that Burke was true when he remarked, "Reforms do not destroy" and "Religion, property and inherited civilization of the past would be submerged in a welter of atheism and democracy".

They now flocked to him and the opinions of the majority turned in his favour. There were still men to oppose his theory. Paine a great revolutionary wrote a book "Rights of man" in which he akin to the principles of Rousseau tried to prove the birth rights of man. He criticised Burke vehemently and considered him an enemy of the birth rights of man. He, however, could not win over the people who had been too much convinced by Burke's theories and who had seen the atrocities of France.

Younger Pitt was rather confused and failed to grasp the real significance of the revolution and the steady changes which it was bringing. When he found the majority of the English masses clinging to the theories of Burke with the progress of revolution he also made up his mind to change himself with the people. He gave up the cause of the reforms and now introduced such measures which might save England from the mis-happenings similar to those of France. He was encouraged by Burke's 'Reflections on the French Revolution'.

There had been a division within the Whig party—Fox propounding the ideas of a Revolution, Burke opposing its ideas because of its destructive tendency.

Younger Pitt well knew that in case of his opposition to the French Revolution he would be supported by a group of the Whigs, led by Burke, so he confidently took up a strong attitude against the French Revolution. When Fox a great revolutionary Whig leader introduced a bill in the Parliament for the repeal of the Test Act, passed during the days of Charles II according to which an oath of loyalty was to be taken to the Church of England at the time of appointment and the Roman Catholics and some other sects thus had been debarred from Government appointments, but he was very badly defeated.

The reactionary to the Revolution had an undisputed majority in the House of Commons. Burke even betrayed his party and with his followers took his seat with Younger Pitt thus strengthening his hold for the suppression of revolutionary ideas. Burke no doubt betrayed the principles which he had advocated in the Parliament. It was to save England and actually for its betterment.

The more the revolution progressed in France the more the people of England grew reactionary. The fall of Bastille led to the fall of the houses of several revolutionary leaders. It led to riots in different parts of England but the target in these riots were not the rich men of England as in France. These were indeed the revolutionaries of England.

When there was an open declaration of the three watch words of 'Liberty, Equality and Fraternity' in France, in England even Habeas Corpus Act was suspended. Now any suspected person could be sent behind the bars without any trial and without any cause shown against him. It has been truly remarked, "while

the torrent of the French Revolution demolished monarchy in France, its back eddies swept Pitt and England into reaction."

Pitt was to some extent justified in his attitude. England was already an upholder of democratic ideas and only at a distance of 16 miles from France. As such it was definitely to be affected by its revolutionary ideas when its waves involved later on the whole of Europe, if Pitt had not taken some preventive measures. An attack on the life of the King confirmed Pitt's belief. The depression caused by the failure of the crop was another factor which according to him at any movement could lead a revolution.

He attacked its very basis in England, i.e. the revolutionary societies. Their officers were raided, their leaders were transported for life or imprisoned and thus the evil was nipped in the bud. A strict watch was kept over the foreign element within England and the Government had been empowered to expel any power if suspected of treason or revolutionary ideas.

Younger Pitt, himself, at a time a great upholder of the reform movements now had been a rigid Tory. When Grey introduced a bill for the reform of the Parliament he opposed it saying that it was not the time to make this type of experiment and got it rejected by the Parliament.

Younger Pitt has been criticised by some writers for his overcautious policy. The people of England themselves had realized the bad effects of the Revolution—they were against the Revolution and they were too submissive and too co-operative towards their Government.

Such repressive measures were not necessary. Younger Pitt actually misused his powers. He took away the birth right of liberty, suspended the constitution and became a sort of dictator. Many men, simply because they were suspected found themselves behind the bars.

It is true that he was led by the cry of repression, as he heard from the different parts of the country, but the policy was opposed by Fox who still upheld the cause of liberty.

We can conclude the effects of the French Revolution on England in the words of Muir :—.

“Thus for Britain the chief result of the French Revolution was a serious reaction and a great set-back to the promising movement for political reform which had been gradually growing in strength.”

Questions

1. What were the causes of the French Revolution of 1789 ?
2. Give a Character sketch of Napoleon Bonaparte.
3. Give an account of Napoleon's designs on the East. How did the British naval victory of Nile frustrate them ?
4. Discuss the significance of the battles of (a) Trafalgar, (b) Austerlitz and (c) Waterloo.

5. Why was Napoleon beaten? (P.U. 1952)
6. What do you understand from the term Continental System? How did England successfully deal with Berlin and Milan decrees?
7. "Spanish Ulcer has ruined me." Napoleon. Elaborate the statement.
8. Describe the part played by Great Britain in the overthrow of Napoleon. (N.U.J.B. 1935)
9. Describe the resistance of Great Britain to the ambitions of Napoleon between 1802 and 1815. (L.G.S. 1936)
10. What contemporary and what subsequent effect did the French Revolution have upon Great Britain? (P.U. 1952)
11. Describe and account for the attitude towards the French Revolution of (a) Pitt, (b) Burke, and (c) Fox. (O.L. 1927)
12. "Misguided and reactionary" Is this a fair criticism of the domestic policy of Pitt after 1793? (O.C. 1929)

CHAPTER XII .

GROWTH OF BRITISH RULE IN INDIA UPTO 1857

The period of Queen Elizabeth is wellknown in English History for the development of English naval power. Spanish Armada was defeated in 1588 and England became 'the mistress of the Seas' as a result of this victory. The English naval supremacy led to the encouragement of its commercial activities.

In 1600 the Queen gave to some English merchants the privilege of trade with the Eastern markets. British East India company was thus formed. It restricted its activities mainly to trade in the beginning but later on it fully exploited the rotten conditions prevailing in India after the disintegration of the Mughal Empire and quite unexpectedly it laid down the foundations of a structure which culminated into a British Empire in India.

It was during the days of Jahangir that the Britishers for the first time visited the Mughal court. The Portuguese, being the people who discovered a route to India via Cape Town, were the first people to establish themselves in India. During the time when **Hawkins** visited the court of the Mughal Emperor, these portuguese had

gained a very high position in the Mughal court. Although Hawkins did not feel the necessity of an interpreter and talked with Jahangir in Turkish language which he could speak fluently but the opposition of the Portuguese did not allow him to gain any concession from the Mughal Emperor. They even made attempts to poison to death, Hawkins, the English traveller to India. He was, thus, compelled to marry an Armenian. One of his followers when died at Agra, the Portuguese would not allow his burial in their cemetery. This opposition, in short, disappointed him and he returned disgusted.

James I sent **Sir Thomas Roe** as his ambassador at the Mughal court. Although he was received cordially yet even he could not gain any privileges and he also returned to his country after a long stay of about 3 years without obtaining any special privileges.

The Britishers carried on their trade during the days of Shahjehan peacefully. The days of Aurangzeb saw the development of some relations between the two sides but it was not particularly with the Britishers.

It was actually with all the European nations carrying on Trade in India. Some European sailors had taken to piracy as their occupation in the Arabian Sea and they plundered all those ships which went from India to the Muslim world. Aurangzeb warned all the traders at the Malabar coast. He held them responsible for the peratic acts of their nationals asked them to pay compensation. After sometime, they were asked to patrol the Arabian Sea and to arrest the pirates responsible for the refarious activities against the Mughal Government. The European merchants agreed to it,

The death of Aurangzeb opened a new chapter in the History of the Europeans, especially, that of the English in India. There was the disintegration of the Mughal Empire and instead of a strong Central authority, the whole of the country was parcelled into several small independent states which were always at war with one another. The British Company had three trading stations, Calcutta on the coast of Bengal, Madras on the Coromandal Coast and Bombay on the Malabar coast. During the days of the Great Mughal Emperor, the British people had to face the opposition of the Portuguese but after the disintegration of the Mughal Empire they had to face the hostility of their traditional enemy, France, who in the wake of the English movement in the East had also followed suit and opened its commercial stations by the side of the English trading centres. By the side of Calcutta there was Chander Nagar and Pondicherry and Mahe were the two commercial stations on the Eastern and Western coasts by the side of Madras and Bombay respectively. The Dutch, another European nation finding themselves not strong enough for the conflict with either the English or the French, had quietly retired to the East Indies. England and France were the two nations which had jumped into the Indian field, in the race of power and wealth. Though the English Company, unlike the French Company was a private concern yet the British Government was always at its beck and call.

After the disintegration of the Mughal Empire India was parcelled into several small states. This, however, in no way, gave an opportunity to the European in the beginning as the rulers of all these small states were strong men who had dared to liberate themselves from the Central Authority. With the passage of time, either due to the weak successors or due to the internal conflicts of these states, the Europeans got a chance as it was clear from the state of Carnatic which fell an easy prey to the foreign diplomacy.

The British Government came into conflict with the French Government in Europe. The effect was felt in India also. It is however interesting that while the two nations jumped at the throat of each other in coromandal regions, they remained at peace in Bengal. It was because while, Anwar-ud-din the ruler of Carnatic was weak, Alivardikhan, the ruler of Bengal, was very strong.

There were **three Carnatic Wars**. The two European nations entangled the Indian States also in their struggles and the wars is not only ended in the ousting of the French from the soil of India but it also led to the supremacy of the Britishers at the courts of Carnatic and Hyderabad, whatsoever, nominal the nature of this British supremacy on the States was.

The Britishers actually had been brought in this political field by Dupleix, who had once dreamt of a French empire in India. Lord Clive got inspired and in collaboration with other servants of the company began to plan for the establishment of British rule in India, even against the wishes of the Home authorities who were more interested in trade than in fighting war.

This spirit brought them into conflict with **Siraj-ul-Daula**, the new ruler of Bengal, Behar and Orissa. The Britishers had conspired with Ghasiti Begum and Shaukat Jang, the two other claimants for the throne of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa. Siraj-ul-Daula although young in age, proved himself equal to the situation and it was as a result of his spirited action and diplomacy both of the claimants were out of the field.

Siraj-ul-Daula turned his attention towards the Britishers also who, taking advantage of the anarchy and dis-

order of Bengal, and fishing in the troubled water had tried to safeguard their position against the French and the Nawab of Bengal by fortifying their basis like Calcutta and others. The British forces were defeated and there was then the **Black Hole Tragedy** of Calcutta as some of the British writers make us believe.

The modern Indian writers, however has refuted the event in strong words as the names of many of the Englishmen mentioned as dead during the Black Hole Tragedy are not correct. They had actually died during the struggle with the forces of Nawab during the latter's siege of Calcutta.

The British Company fully exploited the situation and inspite of the fact that Hollwell, the narrator of the event, was not a reliable man they asked for the compensation. Even after gaining compensation, they were not satisfied and they conspired against the Nawab, with his treacherous commander-in-chief, Mir Jafar and some of the bankers of Bengal for the end of Siraj-ul-Dula's rule.

It is strange enough that Siraj-ul-Daula at this stage demonstrated enough of demoralization in his dealing with the Britishers. In stead of punishing them and taking a resolute action against their haughty letters he clung to his treacherous Commander-in-Chief for the latter's advice in the matter.

After the conspiracy was complete and Amin Chand was also satisfied by a forged letter, Clive, the moving spirit of the Britishers in India, moved with his forces towards Murshidabad. Siraj-ul-Daula could not expect

any help from the French at this critical stage as they had been greatly weakened by an attack of the Britishers on their port town of Chander Nagar.

The struggle which is not at all interesting or important from the point of view of blood shed, ended in favour of the Britishers in the field of **Plassey**. It was more by treachery than by an actual struggle that the great work was accomplished by the Britishers.

They did not directly take the reins of government with their hands but were satisfied with the accession of their puppet, **Mir Jafar**, who had blackened his face by treachery to his master and to the honour of his nation by joining the enemies. He appeased the British Company by giving it the regions of 24 Parganas and by bribing its officers. They accepted bribe openly thus brought a blot on the name of their nation.

Mir Jafar, however, could not pull on nicely for a long time with the British Company. The British Company and especially its servants who had once been accustomed to bribes like a wolf who had tasted blood were not going to know peace. They wanted war or some revolution or at least some changes which may be effected with some fortunes for them.

Mir Jafar was estranged with the company when it tried to impose its will on the Nawab in all the matters. He now began to think whether he or the company was actually the sovereign of the State. In bewildered state of mind he was making alliances with the Mughal Emperor, who was still lurking on the throne

of India and observing all formalities and the Dutch who had since long left Indian political field.

The Dutch landed in a large number of about 1500 at Chinsura, the last Dutch hold in Bengal but Clive proved too alert for them. He defeated them and compelled them to surrender. The Mughal Emperor had sent his son Prince Ali Gohar at the head of a small force to recapture Bengal, Bihar and Orissa and to rule there as a viceroy. The combined forces of the British Company and the Nawab of Bengal, under Miran, defeated the Mughal Prince. He escaped from the battle field. The British Company suspected Miran for the escape of Prince Ali Gohar.

Then there happened a tragedy in the death of Miran. The Britisher wrote to Mir Jafar that the death had occurred as a result of lightening which befell on the tent of Miran. But the Nawab was not satisfied with their explanation. He thought that the Britishers were responsible for the death of Miran.

The ill-will thus created and the refusal of Nawab to pay for the British forces which fought against the Mughal Prince widened the gulf, still further. The approach of **Mir Kasim** the son-in-law of Mir Jafar to the company and his promise of paying off the arrears of forces, 5 lacs for the Carnatic wars, surrender of the regions of Midnapur, Chittagong and Burdwan, and last but not the least an amount of Rs. 50,000 to the Governor Vansittart Rs. 27,000 to Hollwel and Rs. 25,000, to each of the two other counsellors, in case he was acknowledged and declared the successor of Mir Jafar further worked as the adding of fuel to the fire and the Governor now started for Murshidabad to get Mir Kasim nominated as the successor of Mir Jafar. The latter refused to accept

the proposal. He was forced to abdicate in favour of Mir Kasim.

Mir Kasim, however, proved himself a very capable man. His strong rule and restoration of peace and prosperity in the state was an eyesore to the British company. Realising, that the British servants misused the trade privilege he declared concession for the whole of his subjects. The British servants found within the concession a great loss to their income and they were now determined to pull him down. They very soon, got the excuse. A quarrel between Ellis the British agent at Patna and some of the officers of Nawab became an immediate cause of the struggle. The British Company declared him deposed and nominated to Mir Jafer, the Nawab of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa again.

Mir Kasim, however, was not going to submit.....The war began. Mir Kasim was defeated and was compelled to take shelter with the ruler of Oudh. The three Muslim rulers, Emperor Shah Alam II, Shuja-ul-Daula, the Nawab of Oudh and Mir Kasim planned an attack of the three Eastern provinces. Major Munro was despatched against them. The fateful battle was fought in the fields of **Buxare**.

"Buxar completed the work of Plassey". In the battle of Plassey the British had won a battle but only on a bewildered Nawab, betrayed by his lieutenant. The victory of Buxar, however, clearly demonstrated before the Eastern world the superiority of the Western Arms. Shuja-ul-Daula again tried his luck but was defeated and the whole of Northern India now lay open before the British Company for a rule. It however hesitated to take such a daring step although there were men like Sir Iyre Coote to ask for the capture of

India as far as the capital city of Delhi. The **treaty of Allahabad** gave to the British Company a legal position of collecting the revenues of the regions of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa.

The **Double Government** in Bengal, Bihar and Orissa ; Defence and Revenue with the Company and the law and order with the Nawab ; went on for some time where appeared the personality of Warren Hastings on the horizon of three badly effected provinces of India. These were indeed the darkest days in the history of three provinces. There were two rulers but actually neither of the two thought it his moral duty to think of the betterment of the people.

Warren Hastings who has been acclaimed as the only honest man in the History of British East India Company during these years could not tolerate this practice. The Double Government was brought to an end and the Nawab was pensioned off. The days of Warren Hastings saw the preservation of the territories which had been conquered during the days of his predecessors. There was the 1st **Marathas** and the Second Mysore wars during his days. Whereas, the Britishers had a bitter experience of the Indian war-fare, the Indian States, especially the **Marathas** had also well realised that the Britishers had established themselves in India and were quite a dangerous rivals in the coming race for supremacy over the Indian peninsula.

The days of Lord **Cornwallis**, although began with the declaration of the policy of non-intervention actually ended in the extension of the British authority in many regions. Tipu, the ruler of Mysore was defeated and crippled as per statement of the Governor-General. The ruler of Hyderabad

was forced to acknowledge the British supremacy over the Guntur regions.

Lord Wellesley was the next important British Governor General in India. He transformed the British Empire in India to a British Empire of India. The British Company was in a very critical position when Lord Wellesley landed in India. They had enemies on all the sides.

Lord Cornwallis at the time of his departure had left a note that he had crippled Sultan Tipu. The latter, however, in spite of his defeat was not discouraged and was very anxious to regain his lost prestige. He was the most dangerous enemy of the Britishers in India and he was so anxious of ousting them from the soil of India that he had even invited the French, the Turkish Sultan and the Afghan ruler to his support. Shah Zaman the ruler of Afghanistan was encamping at Lahore and was planning an invasion in the interiors of India.

Sir John Shore, the predecessor of Lord Wellesley by not helping the Nizam of Hyderabad when the latter was attacked by the **Marathas** had estranged him. He turned out all the Britishers from his employment as a protest and had given a chance to the French.

The Marathas after their victory at Kharda on Nizam of Hyderabad had got a new spirit in them. They had been so greatly encouraged that they were again dreaming of their past glories when their flag was being hoisted from the city of Attock and Cuttack.

Thus the Britishers were to face all these people when Lord Wellesley came to India as Governor-General.

He was a true imperialist and was not going to give way to despair. He started a new system of alliance called a "**Subsidiary System**" by which he tried to convert the British Empire in India to the British Empire of India. All those nations who accepted the Subsidiary System were to maintain a British army at their cost. They were to have a British resident at their court and not to keep a European in their Service without a prior sanction of the British East India Company. Their foreign policy was also to be controlled by the British Company. If a ruler accepted all these clauses the British Company promised to protect his country from the foreign aggression.

The Nizam of Hyderabad who had been greatly weakened by the **Marathas'** aggression and who every now and then expected an other aggression was the first ruler to accept the clauses of Subsidiary System.

Lord Wellesley next asked the Sultan of Mysore to accept the Subsidiary System and at his refusal declared a war upon him. The Sultan of Mysore was defeated and killed and Lord Wellesley took away the greater part of his territories. Part of it was resorted to Krishan, a member of the old Hindu family from whom Hyder Ali had captured the throne. The new raja accepted Subsidiary System.

The Nawab of Oudh and Carnatic were next forced to accept the clauses of the new system. He then turned his attention towards the Marathas. It was not easy to bring them down. The Peshwa was offered a part of the captured Mysore territories, provided he accepted the Subsidiary System. Peshwa refused to accept either of the two proposals.

Nana Fadnavis died in 1800 and with him 'departed the wisdom of the Marathas'. Their internal struggle gave to Lord Wellesley another chance and he availed of it. Peshwa Baji Rao II after his defeat from the forces of Holkar went to Bombay and by the Treaty of Bassein accepted the clauses of the Subsidiary System.

He was promised restoration to his throne. The restoration of Peshwa Baji Rao II was peaceful as Holkar had retired to his regions. It, however, brought no peace to the Britishers. It entangled them into long wars with the other Maratha Chiefs. The humiliation of Peshwa Baji Rao II led to the automatic humiliation of all the other Maratha chiefs. They resented the policy of Lord Wellesley and asked him to relieve the Peshwa from the obligations of the Subsidiary System. He refused and it led to the Second and Third Maratha wars. During the Second Maratha war Bhonsle and Sindhia were defeated and were deprived of a great part of their territories. Holkar was also defeated but could not be cowed down owing to the recall of Lord Wellesley to England.

The days of Sir George Barlow were uneventful while Lord Minto during his period of Governor-Generalship was too much absorbed in counter-acting the designs of Napoleon on India through Iran and Afghanistan.

The days of **Lord Hastings** saw the completion of the work of Lord Wellesley. The Marathas were finally defeated and compelled to accept Subsidiary System. Peshwa Baji Rao II was, however, deprived of his territories and pensioned off. The Gorkhas were also defeated and compelled to surrender the Garhwal and some other regions of the South West. They were

to keep a resident at their court and their foreign policy was to be controlled by the British Company.

The days of **Lord Ahmerst** saw the spread of British influence in the East and the North East. The rising power of the Burmese was broken in the 1st Burmese War and their general Mahā Bundela who had come with the intention of arresting British Governor General was defeated at Donaben and killed. They were asked to surrender the regions of Arakan, Tennaserim and Assam.

The days of **Lord William Bentinck** were, however, comparatively the days of peace and the Governor-General was busy in the establishment of a strong rule in the conquered regions. He touched every department of the Government and brought one improvement or the other in it. It was decided that the amount of one lakh, to be spent in India for the education of the Indians, was to be spent for the progress of English language. Many reforms, like abolition of Sati, infanticide and human sacrifices were brought in social order and by arresting several Thugs in the Central Indian regions it was made possible for the common people to travel from one part of the country to the other without any danger of the robbers and the Thugs. Maharaja Ranjit Singh of the Panjab had his designs on Sind. He was checked in his ambitions. He was invited in a conference at Rooper and was befriended.

The days of **Lord Auckland** saw further aggression although the attempt for extension of Empire could not be successful. The 1st Afghan War remarked as unjustified by all the writers was started. Auckland, however, could not be successful and the disaster of British army, coming back from Kabul, led to his recall.

Lord Ellenborough, the next Governor-General although brought an end to the war and saved further destruction, yet his impolitic speech, that their forces had borne the gates of Som Nath and thus the defeat of Seven hundred years before had been avenged, turned the Muslims of India against him. The Hindus did not enjoy the event as the gates were not those gates which Mahmud had taken away from India. His next step was the annexation of Sind through his agent Sir Charles Napier which even according to the latter was an advantageous, useful and humane piece of rascality.

Lord Ellenborough retired and **Lord Hardinge** next came to India as Governor General. The annexation of Sind by the Britishers estranged their relations with the Sikhs and their disastrous return from Afghanistan encouraged them for a struggle with the British company which was too unjustified in its policy towards the Sikhs at every stage.

The 1st Sikh War was fought. The Sikhs fought very bravely but were defeated due to the treachery of their generals. The Treaty of Lahore gave to the British Company the Doab regions between river Sutlej and Beas.

Lord Dalhousie, perhaps the greatest Governor-General of the British Company in India succeeded Lord Hardinge. He was an imperialist in the true sense. The Sikhs were dragged into a war. He defeated them and annexed the Panjab. Dalip Singh, the young Maharaja was pensioned off and sent to England. The Burmese were also defeated and the regions of Lower Burma were annexed. Doctrines of Lapse policy was followed very strictly. No ruler was allowed to adopt a son. The states of Satara, Jhansi, Nagpur and Jaitpur were thus

annexed. The state of Oudh was annexed for mal-administration. He also introduced many reforms. Telegraphic system was completed; postal system was started; and Railway lines were laid down. He completed the work started by Lord Wellesley and the Britishers now were the undisputed masters of India.

His policy, however, was not liked by the Indians and his Doctrines of Lapse led to a great discontentment amongst the other States. The annexation of Oudh was not justified and was a blunder.

A letter was sent to the Mughal Emperor Bahadur Shah who was still lingering in Delhi and preserving the remnants of the Mughal Empire by some formalities, informing him that after his death his sons would not be allowed to enjoy the title and they would have to vacate even the royal palaces. Nana Sahib, the adopted son of Peshwa Baji Rao II, was refused pension and thus estranged.

During the days of **Lord Canning**, the rule of the British Company due to its political ambitions, social changes (not liked by Indians and observed with suspicion) economic exploitation and religious persecution became unbearable. It culminated into a revolution, painted by the contemporary British historians as a Mutiny of 1857. It was, however, not successful in its object due to several reasons but it had one great effect. It changed master for the Indians and the control of the Indian affairs was taken from the British Company by the British Government by Queen Victoria's declaration of 1858.

The Board of control was abolished and in its place was appointed a Secretary of State with 15 counsellors.

The Governor General in future was to be called a Viceroy. The relations between the Paramount Power and the Indian States after this date were quite different from the already in vogue. They were allowed in future to adopt sons. The Queen promised the Indians that they would be given a chance in the Government in future without any discrimination of caste and creed. They were given freedom of worship. Thus there was opened a new chapter in the History of India.

Questions

1. Compare the services of Clive and Warren Hastings to the expansion of British rule in India.
2. "Lord Wellesley converted the British Empire in India to British Empire of India." Do you agree.
3. Give an account of the Growth of British rule in India from 1805—1850.

CHAPTER XIII

AGRARIAN REVOLUTION IN ENGLAND

The Nature of Advance

England has been styled as "the workshop of the world." But this term is not a term of the yore. It came into vogue only after the Industrial Revolution had become an accomplished fact. Agriculture was a "running concern" till the end of the third quarter of the nineteenth century.

History of the British agriculture falls into three stages. First was the **servile stage** during which the soil was owned by great proprietors and was cultivated by slaves. Second was the **manorial stage** of the middle Ages, marked by its semi-feudal character. Soil was owned by feudal lords and cultivated by persons, neither slave nor free. Third is the **contractual stage** of more recent times when the relationship between the owner and the tiller is determined by their voluntary agreement. "The advance of agriculture in Europe has mainly been determined by the transition from second to the third stage, *i.e.* by the break up of the manorial system."¹

1. Eco. Devt. of Modern Europe by Frederic Austin Ogg and Walter Rice Sharp Page 17.

Features of Manorial System

People dwelt in huts, erected round the parish Church or round the manor-house of the proprietor..... From the village stretched open-fields in all directions. Holdings were not enclosed by any fence. Quite a lump of the manor-land was used by the proprietor himself, who was usually a knight, a count, a duke, a bishop, an abbot, or even a king. Two-field and three-field systems were in operation, according to which one out of two or three portions of land lay fallow every year. Of the cultivated fields under three-field system, one was planted ordinarily with wheat, rye or other crops harvested in summer and the other with oats, barley, pear or other crops harvested in spring. Common-field system was used in three-fifths of the cultivated land. The remainder of the manor consisted of champion or waste, which was a common-land on which the oxen and sheep of the manor grazed. There was a great subdivision and fragmentation of land and the strips under one tenant were not necessarily contiguous. Most arduous of agricultural operations was ploughing. The great plough was drawn by eight small, underfed, thin and muscular oxen. At the time of its existence, the manorial system was universal and had the element of uniformity of organisation and working. "Cultivation was carried on for subsistence and not for marketing, though in the later Middle Ages, a certain amount of surplus produce was sold."² This was because of the isolated economy of the villages, caused by the lack of modes of communications and transport.

2. English Eco. History by Southgate P. 17.

Uses and the Drawbacks of Manorial System

The system which survived for so many centuries must have had much to commend it. People lived with a fair degree of comfort. Economic independence to the settled occupiers was assured. The ennobling principle of corporate and co-operative life was honoured. Manor was a compactly organised, economically self-sufficient and socially independent unit.

Portraying the black side of the manorial picture, "the wasteful farming and the very existence of the common-fields system were the most serious obstacles to the illuminated empiricism"³ of the later days. Communal cultivation, regulated by custom, prevented intelligent and enterprising men from making experiments. "The rotation of crops, the time of ploughing and sowing, the use of meadow and pasture, the erection and removal of hedges, the maintenance of roads and paths were determined entirely by the community, on the basis of rigid custom and the individual enjoyed little or no freedom"⁴. The open-field system was old-fashioned, wasteful and unprofitable. Scattered character of the holdings involved waste of time and energy. There were continual quarrels caused by the trespassing of the unfenced fields. Due to the uncertain terms of tenure, the man behind the plough did not effect any improvements in the land. Moreover, the acquisition of land by small proprietors was rendered difficult. Dealings of the lord with the tenant were arbitrary and harsh. Crops were few, seed varieties were unimproved, and methods of cultivation were out-of-date. The system had in fact outlived its usefulness and had become a nuisance.

-
3. England under the Hanoverians by C. Grant Robertson P. 331.
 4. Eco. Development of Modern Europe by Ogg and Sharp. P. 24.

Disappearance of Manorial System

In the later middle ages serfdom disappeared and new methods of using the land were evolved. Manorial relationship disappeared from the social set-up of the village life. With the Black Death labour became scarce and wages rose. This resulted in abandonment of land by Lords and the leasing of it to tenants. These leases led to unequal holdings and prepared ground for capitalistic farming. The alienation of Lord's demesne contributed much to the destruction of manorial system. In the meantime, the substitution of money payments for labour services had also changed the lord vis-a-vis serf relationship. Three types of land tenure had thus arisen :

(1) *Free holders* who were most secure and most favoured. They were protected by law from eviction, confiscation, or forced purchase of holdings, arbitrary fines and other exactions ;

(2) *Lease holders* were the products of demesne land. They held land from a freeholder for a term of years, and

(3) *Copy holders* with whom the arrangements were set down in writing. They were first protected by only the good faith of the lord, but later, courts were prepared to recognise their rights.

The Revolution

Great socio-economic readjustments took place in the latter half of the 18th century and the 1st quarter of the nineteenth century. According to the authors of the Economic Development of Modern Europe, "the changes by which England of 1750 was converted into

the England of 1825 were not political but entirely economic and social." The Agricultural Revolution embodied, among other things, the concentration of land in lesser hands, the revived enclosure of common lands, the reduction of large number of tenants and small owners to the status of wage-earning agricultural labourers and the elimination of a considerable percentage of agricultural population from agricultural profession altogether. The Revolution began in the closing decades of the eighteenth century and lost its initial momentum by the close of the first half of the nineteenth century.

The revolution was not the product of a spontaneous outburst of the agricultural population. Labourers were certainly averse to the changes because they brought in their train unemployment, destitution, disease and starvation.

Upto 1760, agriculture prospered within the bondage of the old agricultural communities. Since 1689 a bounty for the export of corn when its price rose above forty-eight shillings, stimulated production; and England, in addition to cope with her own domestic demand used to export corn abroad. The British farmer was protected from Irish competition; and even Whig political theory supported the promotion of the interests of a Tory squirearchy.

During the same period, the conservatism of British agriculture felt a great jerk from two brilliant pioneers. Jethro Tull, at Mount Properous in Berkshire, and Townshend, at Rainham in Norfolk, introduced the turnip, and taught the advantages of proper drilling and manuring, the treatment of soils, a more scientific rotation of crops, and the value of artificial grasses. Progress in agricultural knowledge was largely due to big landlords who desired large profits by combining the functions of

capital and land with labour. But the advance as yet was "local, accidental and halting".⁵ Various portions of the country saw improvement in various agricultural operations: The fallow year was eliminated; corn crops were grown in alternate years; in the intervening years a clove crop and a root crop were produced; stock-breeding received much attention; the introduction of turnips and other root crops solved the problem of winter-feeding; by the drill of Jéthro Tull a hole or furrow was made in the ground and seed was dropped regularly into it; smaller quantities of seed were used and better crops resulted. Contrivances like the mechanical string binder, the stream tractor and the electrical plough economised the labour used on the farms.

Royal patronage was given to the movement for the improvement of agriculture. George III, the Farmer King, established a model farm at Windsor. Arthur Young, secretary of the Board of the Agriculture contributed much by his own extensive knowledge of English and French agricultural techniques. The growth of population expanded the market. "The establishment of the Board of Agriculture in 1793, under Sir John Sinclair and Young himself, is an event of economic and historic importance which fully crowned the labours of three generations"⁶ Capitalism and the power of capital had developed in the agricultural field. After 1830 methods of field-drainage were discovered to bring clay lands into cultivation. In 1838 the Royal Agricultural Society and in 1842 Agricultural Chemistry Association were organised. The theory of agriculture also saw a great advance.

Enclosure Movement

The Revolution manifested itself in the development of enclosures for sheep-farming also. The term "enclos-

5. C. Grant Robertson p. 205.

6. C. Grant Robertson p. 330.

ure" is employed to designate consolidation of fragmented strips into compact land, surrounded by hedges; conversion of arable into pasture; and concentration of holdings by the occupation of the waste—lands, thus breaking up the common ties. The change was brought about by the defects in the old system and impetus was provided by the brisk demand, at comparatively higher prices, for wool in English and Netherland's markets. Pasture-farming also reduced the costs by affecting economy in the use of the costly labour. Capitalistic enterprise, with all its paraphernalia of employer-employee relationships consequent upon the extortions made by the employers, was now in the offing. The concentration of land caught momentum with the increased purchases of land by industrial capitalists to augment their social status. To be a merchant was thought to be a "social stigma" and "distinctly inferior". The agricultural distress of the post—Napoleonic wars and the intermarriages between the land-owning families redoubled the pace of concentration.

The results of the enclosure movement were far-reaching. Landless labourers multiplied in "land-hunting" and the result was ignominy of "vagabondage" to which the society began to be subjected. Poor Law of 1601 enacted by Elizabeth was the direct responsibility of the irresponsible increase in enclosure movement which had preceded. In 1710 a new form of enclosure movement started with the licences issued under a special act of Parliament, rather than by simple private action. These hedges are still a prominent feature of the English countryside. No doubt the hedges were a necessity at the time but they were not brought forth in a desired way. The farmer became worse off because of the cost of enclosing; the elimination of the land for grazing and the legal expenses of the change which he was required to meet.

able condition and the result of more scientific and economic agriculture; that in the long run it added enormously to the productive resources of the nation; that without it the new population could not have been fed, the industrial revolution stimulated, and the strain of great war endured, is generally accepted".

The period of Napoleonic wars was one of great prosperity for landlords and farmers. All the newly invented techniques could not cope with the additional demand placed by the increased population—which increased by 50% from 1750 to 1801. With the increased prices, marginal land was brought under cultivation during the wars. This resulted in increased rents also.

Corn Laws and the Agricultural Distress

The war had begun to finish some day. After 1815, bad harvests and violent fluctuations of prices were bringing wide-spread ruin upon agriculturists. In the hope of assisting them, the legislature in 1815 passed Corn Law prohibiting the importation of wheat until the price reached 80 shillings a quarter. This Law was in fact a "proposal to secure the prosperity of a class at the expense of the nation as a whole."⁸ The legislation afforded no relief when, as in 1816, the price fell to 52 shillings and 6 pence. The greatest of English industry appeared to be threatened with imminent ruin. Bread became dear and the underlings of society were depressed. The price of corn was not stabilised and the landed interests, therefore, did not realise the anticipated advantage. The unprecedented level of taxation proved

8. South gate.

to be the last straw on camels back. Reports received by Board of Agriculture in response to a circular letter issued in 1816 attest the severity of the crisis. Sir J. A. R. Marriot notes in his "England since Waterloo" the findings of the Board. "Farmers, who a few years ago were competing eagerly for farms, were sending in notices to quit, and many farms were unlet; mortgages found it difficult to realise; credit was collapsing; banks were failing in all directions; substantial farmers were becoming parish paupers." And while the producer was ruined, the consumer derived no benefit. In December, 1816 wheat which in the spring had fallen to 52 shillings 6d. rose to 103 shillings. Agriculture had become a mere gamble. Mr. C. C. Western M. P. wrote to Creevey in Creevey Papers that "I assume the landed people are getting desperate; the universality of ruin among them or distress bordering on it is absolutely unparalleled.

The Anti Corn Law League was founded in 1838 by a group of Lancashire manufacturers. After a hard struggle by the protagonists of this League, and by the personal initiative of Sir Robert Peel, particularly after the Irish Potato Famine in 1845 the Corn Laws were repealed in the year 1846.

1850—75

The period of 1850—1875 is called the 'Golden Age of English agriculture'. During this period agricultural techniques improved and scientific research was promoted. The study of agricultural chemistry, drills, threshing machines and steam ploughs came into common use in English farms. The development of the means of communications brought machines, fertilizers, seeds and markets nearer the fields. The list of field-crops was extended. Stock-breeding was given increased attention.

1875—.....

Due to certain irresistible factors agriculture had an unprecedented set-back in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Firstly, between 1875—1884 cold springs and rainy summers; and during the nineties, the draughts did the undoing. Secondly, the development of the means of communications on land and sea brought the grain yielding areas of Russia, America, Egypt, India and Argentina in direct competition with the British agriculture. Thirdly, the industry eclipsed agriculture and fourthly, poor harvests, cattle plague and sheep rot added fuel to the fire of agricultural distress. The result was an almost one-third increase in pasturage during 1876—1906. Prothero in his 'Pioneers and Progress' says that "Foreign competition, coming on the back of unprosperous seasons, completed the ruin of English farmers. They were unable to recover themselves and went from bad to worse." The prices of wheat which were 44s. per quarter in 1875 and 50s in 1877, declined to 32s. in 1885 and 17s—6d. in 1889. The process of depopulation started afresh. Agricultural labourer was, in the words of Bennett in his 'Problems of Village Life', "a poor man, living in a poor house on poor food." Collings has also described him in his 'Land Reforms' as "a unique and pathetic figure in the social life of England; a man striving in the midst of plenty through a life of patient endurance and ceaseless toil, lightened by no hope for the morrow or any prospect but the workhouse and the grave." Village depopulation brought over-crowding with all its paraphernalia to the industrial towns and seaports, increasing the problems of employment, housing etc., etc. In the village, supply of labourers fell more sharply than the demand for them was falling. At the same time old and inactive elements were left to work in the lands.

Later, Royal Commissions on Agriculture were appointed one after another to point out the causes of the

agricultural decline and to suggest remedies to bring back the hoary past, but it does not require much sense to understand that the "granary" of the world had already been converted into the "work—shop" of the world. The cycle had come and gone never to return with anti-cyclonian wings.

Questions

1. What were the main features of the Agrarian Revolution in England ? Did it really revolutionise the British rural life ?
2. "Agrarian Revolution was an immediate bane and an ultimate boon." Critically examine this statement.
3. How far was the enclosure movement successful in eliminating the drawbacks of the manorial system ?

CHAPTER XIV

THE EASTERN QUESTION

The Mohammdans in the 16th and 17th centuries were ruling despotically quite a major portion of Asia, Africa and Eastern Europe. The Turkish Sultan had under his sway Egypt, Tunis, Tripoli and Morocco in Africa and the Balkan states in Eastern Europe. The boundaries of Turkey, where they were joined to those of Russia on one side, were also joined with those of Austria in Europe through Balkans. But in 19th century, the Turks were loosing their hold in the Balkans due to the independence movement inspired in these small states by the ideals of the French Revolution, *viz.* "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity."

These small states of Balkans, *viz.* Greece, Serbia, Montenegro, Balaria Roumania, etc., were all christians and they had at least the moral support if not the active one of practically all the nations of Europe which were their co-religionists, in the cause of their freedom. But unfortunately many political designs were attached to this question. The freedom of these small states of Balkans was not to be an easy matter. They were used as pawns in the hands of big nations of Europe. The result was that this Eastern Question prolonged and it took about a century (from 1815-1919) to settle it and the disbandment of the Turkish Empire. It was finally settled by the 1st World War.

Whereas Russia wanted an easy end of this problem to help him to increase his influence in Balkans,

England and Austria were deadly against it due to political reasons. This would have meant for the English to loose their Eastern possessions and to Austria, it threatened its very existence. Certain parts of Serbia and Montenegro were also under Austria, who well knew, that in case Serbia got out of the clutches of Turks, Austria would also have to surrender its part of Serbia and Montenegro because they would not then tolerate the subjugation of a part of their territory under the rule of Austrians too. That is why both of these countries were silent when these states of Balkans rose up for their independence.

The Turkish rule was not only despotic but they were also highly prejudiced against their christian subjects. A vast comparison between Muslims and non-Muslims was always maintained. In fact the rulers due to their religious bias hated and despised christians and they were also to pay Poll-tax, Land-tax or proportion of produce. These taxes were collected regularly and severely. Such ruthless suppression of their subjects coupled with the French Revolutionaries' slogans of "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity" instigated the Balkanites to wage a war of their independence from the Turkish Yoke.

This was also the time when the Turkish Sultan was becoming weak and hence with the sympathies of their co-religionists in Europe, this was the most opportune time for these slave-nations to rise for their independence. Russia in fact was so powerful, that had not the French, the English and the Austrians, stood in its way, it would not only have freed Balkans but also would have defeated Turks in their own land and captured Constantinople—thecherished city of the Christian-dom. The capture of Constantinople would have also given Russia a much needed outlet in the Mediterranean sea,

Unfortunately the power politics would not allow it to happen so. France had its intentions on the Turkish African Colonies of Egypt, Algeria and Morocco. Spain too was winking at Morocco. Italy wanted to possess Tunis and Tripoli. Britishers were afraid of their Eastern possessions. Though the Britishers had the key to the Mediterranean Sea-Gibraltar—but they could not tolerate the Russian fleet in their way by sea. They were greedy enough to possess single handily the huge Mediterranean sea. We, therefore, see that the simple question of the freedom of the Balkan states was made so very much complex by the political powers that all the goodwill of and sympathies of the whole Christianity could not solve it so easily.

If only the Governments of Europe had risen a bit higher from their power politics, there is little doubt to the fact that not only this Eastern Question would have been solved nicely and quickly, but also the present generation would have been saved the disastrous calamities of the two great World Wars, in the present century. But when have human actions been governed by reason and especially in the inter-national sphere. Humanity from times immemorial has been suffering because of ambitions and jealousies of the people in power and the Eastern Question could not have been any exception. Thus the fate of the Balkan states hung in suspension for about a century and a great current of discontentment ran through it for such a long time.

We divide this Eastern Question into the following four phases :—

1. **Greek Independence.**
2. **Egyptian Question.**
3. **Crimean War.**
4. **Liberation of Balkan States.**

Greek Independence

Of all the nations of Balkans, Greeks were the most independence loving nation. They still remembered the days of Alexander the Great. They could not reconcile themselves—the descendants of conquerors of the world—to be the slaves of this one time subjects. This badly hurt this self respect. They, whose country had produced Aristotle, Plato and Socrates, were now not only slaves of a despotic Sultan, but were also being very inhumanly treated by their conquerors. This was too much for them. Their spirit was antagonising them. They were burning with the fire of freedom. Inspired from within and instigated by Russia, who was the sworn enemy of Turkey and also the protector of the Greek Church, the Greeks rose in revolt against their Turkish Sultan in 1821. The Greeks now not only wanted to be free but also desired to establish the Byzantine Empire at Constantinople. Such was their moral quantum.

The Greeks in the first instance over-estimated their strength but when the Turkish Sultan had some victories, they were forced to ask for the active help of Russia. In Europe too, there was the mass feeling of helping their co-religionists in their freedom struggle. England due to its political intentions could not declare a 'crusade' but on the insistent mass public demonstrations, allowed its people to go and fight for the Greeks. Such was the religious frenzy in England, that even one legged Byron started to fight for the cause of the Greeks. Thus thousands of volunteers from all over Europe started pouring in Greece.

Russia was similarly placed in a very awkward position. Russia as an upholder of the ideals of despotism was supposed to take up the cause of Turkey and to suppress a national rising of the Greeks which had a democratic Government as its goal. She, however, was

helpless as in the Eastern Question her policy was to see the disintegration of the Turkish empire. As a protector of the Greek type of church she was also supposed to take up the cause of the Greeks who were her co-religionist. She, being between the two fires, thought it better to maintain neutrality.

In such difficult times, the Turkish fleet, mistook an English Fleet in the Bay of Navarino to be a Greek Fleet. It opened fire on the English Fleet, which in retaliation absolutely crippled the Turkish Fleet. This God sent boon resulted in strengthening the Greek positions. The Turks were, therefore, forced to grant freedom to Greece in 1829 by the **Treaty of Adrianople**.

Thus with the independence of Greece, we finish with the first phase of the Eastern Question.

Egyptian Question

Mehmet Ali, Turkish viceroy of Egypt gained ascendancy and prestige during the last few years by his courage, valour and organising capacity. During the Greek war of Independence he was always found at the beck and call of the Turkish Sultan. Mehmet Ali defeated the Greeks and the latter perhaps would have been completely crushed by the former if they had not got a timely support from the European powers.

During the war, Mehmet Ali realized the weakness of the Sultan of Turkey and far sighted, as he was, he was determined to exploit that weakness whenever an opportunity arose. He was encouraged in his object by the French who desired to gain concessions from him in Egypt.

The French had already obliged the Sultan by organizing his army on the European pattern and by lending an helping hand in improving his trade. The French advised Mehmet Ali to ask for many concessions from the Turkish Sultan, for services which he rendered to him during the Greek war of independence. Thus encouraged by the French, Mehmet Ali refused to accept minor concessions offered to him by the Sultan of Turkey. The Sultan of Turkey could not offer him more concessions in spite of the Egyptian viceroy's help as the Sultan had finally lost the battle against the Greeks. Mehmet Ali asked the Sultan to acknowledge his independence, and to grant an hereditary right to his family to the throne of Egypt. He also wanted to secure for his son Ibrahim the viceroyalty of Syria. The Sultan of Turkey refused to agree to the clauses put forward by the Egyptian viceroy and this led to a war.

Ibrahim, the son of Mehmet Ali, advanced at the head of a grand army and after over running the whole of Syria he marched upon Asia Minor. The defeat of the Turks laid open to him the road to Constantinople and but for the help of the Europeans the capture of the Turkish capital by the Egyptians was only a matter of a few days. Mehmet Ali was in high spirits as he had the indirect support of the French and the English who could be counted upon by the Turkish Sultan as his great patrons were too much involved in their internal problems and thus were unable to come to his rescue.

Russia was another power which could fish in troubled waters. Mehmet Ali did not expect her intervention as she was in favour of the disintegration of Turkey. Russia, however, unexpectedly plunged herself in that political arena to gain some concessions from the Turkish Sultan. France tried to prevent the interference of Russia in the Turkish problem but without any success.

The timely help of Russia saved the Turkish Sultan from utter humiliation and it prevented Egyptians from further advance. Russia gained for her services the key to Black Sea as concession from the Turkish Sultan by the **Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi** of 1833. Russians were free to move their fleet within the sea, and as no other power was permitted to use the sea Russia's southern borders were protected.

When the clauses of the Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi were made known to England there was a great excitement in political circles. Russia was in a position to pacify Austria and Prussia but England could never be reconciled, and she took rest only when later on the clauses of the Treaty were abrogated during the year 1841 as the result of the Conference of London.

The Russian support against Mehmet Ali helped the Sultan of Turkey to have a honourable settlement with the Egyptians. The Egyptian viceroy was given the regions of Syria and Adana. The Russians were asked to withdraw to their country.

The Egyptian question was again opened in 1837 when Mehmet Ali at the instigation of the French asserted his independence. The British Government was in a bewildered state. She knew that the Turkish Sultan was no match for the ambitious viceroy of Egypt although he had organized his army on the European model. The British feared that in the case of a struggle between Mehmet Ali and the Sultan of Turkey, Russia would join the latter and thus would demand further concessions. Thus she tried to pacify the rising danger. She, however, failed and now began to approach the European nations for a joint action against Egypt.

In the meantime the Egyptians defeated the Turkish forces. To add to the miseries of Turkey the Sultan

died at this critical juncture and the Turkish admiral after deserting his master joined the opposite side. Every thing now looked favourable for Mehmet Ali. England at the news of these mishaps had only two ways open to her. Either she should take a determined attitude towards the problem and take up the cause of Turkey or she should allow the ambitious viceroy to establish himself over the greater part of Turkey and thus indirectly increase the prestige of France in the eyes of the Europeans. She took up a strong attitude and in league with Russia, Austria and Prussia declared a war upon the Egyptian viceroy when the latter at the instigation of France rejected an offer of the European nations for a peaceful settlement.

The British fleet bombarded Acre and checked the advance of the Egyptians. There was a change of ministry in France in the meantime and the new ministry had its leanings more towards a peaceful settlement. The long outstanding dispute was thus settled by the conference of the European nations which met at London in 1841. The following terms were agreed upon:—

1. Mehmet Ali acknowledged the overlordship of the Turkish Sultan. The pashalik was, however, conferred upon him by the Turkish Sultan permanently and his successors were to inherit the viceroyalty without the least interference of the Turkish Sultan.

2. Syria was restored to the Sultan of Turkey.

3. As for England herself, she maintained that England had only done her duty towards her ally. Thus with this master diplomacy of England Russia too was forced not to ask for any concessions from Turkey. The Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi by which Russia had gained influence in Turkey and Balkan stood abrogated. Russia was no more dangerous for peace. It was a great achievement

of Palmerston. The Relations between Russia and France cooled down as the latter considered Russia responsible for the humiliation of Mehmet Ali, her ally. Thus there was the end of the second phase of Eastern Question.

Crimean War

The independence of the Greeks had encouraged the other Balkan States. They were inspired to rise similarly for their independence and to take rest only when they had gained it. The ideals of 'Liberty, Equality and Fraternity' had been engraved on their heart by the revolutionary movements of Europe. The revolution of 1848 gave further impetus to their struggle. They also knew that they had with them the moral support of all the Christians of Europe.

It was, however, not tolerable to the Sultan of Turkey. He tried to suppress their national risings with an iron hand. He himself was now not strong enough to maintain properly his authority on these states. Their rising had created a sort of hatred in his mind for his Christian subjects.

With a vengeance he now suppressed their struggles for their independence. Economically he exploited them. Socially he degraded them. He tried to create inferiority complex in them lest they might claim equality with their Muslim lords. He persecuted them in their religious policy. By depriving them of all the responsible Government appointments, he tried to enslave them politically. He was, however, not successful. The Christians of the Balkan regions looked upon the Czar of Russia as their great patron.

Nicholas I was the then Czar of Russia. He was

very reasonable and frank type of man. Naturally he could not betray their confidence and took up their cause. He had great personal charms and impressed every person he came into contact with. He was very anxious to solve this Balkan problem amicably. He found that England was the only obstacle and he wanted to remove that. A meeting, therefore, was arranged between Nicholas I of Russia and Victoria, the Queen of England. England on her part had always suspected the designs of Russia in the East. If England during the Eastern Question always opposed Russia and stood for the integrity of the Turkish Empire, it was because she was afraid of the Russian extension of power in the troubled region. Russian increase of power was an eyesore to England. Russia and England were already in battle array in the Middle East and England always expected Russian aggression over its Eastern possessions of India.

The move of the Czar of Russia for a conference between the rulers of the two countries—England and Russia—for a settlement, although appreciated by the English politicians, was yet in no way to allay their suspicion of the Russian designs in the East. Nicholas I impressed the Queen of England by his frank discussion but still the problem remained unsolved because of the opposition of Palmerston, the then foreign Secretary of England.

Nicholas I in his conversation declared that the Turkish empire was bound to fall very soon. His remark, "The Sick man of Europe is on our hands. We should settle the disposal of his remains lest he dies on our hands. Thus making the problem still more complicated" was a very justified one. Alas! England did not appreciate the spirit. The Russian Czar could not come to any settlement. His remark, instead of allaying the suspicion confirmed the belief of England that he was determined

to see the dissolution of the Turkish Empire. His proposal to divide the Turkish Empire between the interested parties exasperated England. England was now thinking of maintaining the integrity of Turkey at all costs. The Czar, therefore, returned to his country disappointed and the problem remained unsolved.

In spite of the fact, that the relations between the two nations had cooled down after this unsuccessful attempt there was no idea of a war. Neither of the two sides was ready to go to that extent over the Balkan question. At this time a great personality appeared on the scene of the political history of Europe. Napoleon III, a nephew of Napoleon Bonaparte, came out successful in the elections of France after the revolution of 1848. He was, however, not satisfied with the position of the President of the French Republic. By a coup d'etat he captured all the powers for himself in 1851. A democratic republic was replaced by a monarchy and he himself became the Emperor in this new type of set-up. He had taken a very bold step. If as an emperor he did not show some of his exceptional achievements it was sure that he would very soon come down. He remembered the exploits of his uncle and followed into his foot-steps. He knew that the sentimental people of France could be won over by some astounding victories abroad. He now wanted a war and when he was determined to have it, it was not very far off to seek.

The French were very much estranged with Russia since their humiliation over the Egyptian question. England was also annoyed at the bold declaration of the Russian Czar for the division of the Turkish empire. With the support of England it was not difficult to humiliate Russia. Napoleon knew that in this way he could raise his prestige in the eyes of his own people who had not forgotten their humiliation. An excuse was wanted. It soon came over the dispute of the Greek

and Latin monks for the guardian-ship of the Holy place of Jerusalem. Russia as a protector of the Greek Church took up the cause of the Greek Monks. In France the majority of the people being Roman Catholics were the followers of the Latin Church. Napoleon III immediately took up the cause of the Latin monks. The Austrians and the Spaniards also supported the Latin monks. The Sultan of Turkey therefore under pressure of several nations acceded to the demand. He gave his decision in favour of the Latin Monks and replaced the Greek Monks by the Latin. The Czar of Russia who was the recognised head of the Greek Church, found within the decision his humiliation and insult. He was now determined to punish the Turkish Sultan whom he had always supported in trouble from the internal insurrections.

The Czar of Russia despatched Prince Menschikoff to the Turkish court. He not only asked for the restoration of the Greek Monks but also wanted his acknowledgement as the protector of all the Christian subjects who followed the Greek type of church. This meant a direct interference of Russia in the internal affairs of Turkey. The Sultan of Turkey consulted, Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, the British ambassador at his court in the matter. The latter suggested to him that he should accept the restoration of the Greek Monks but should politely refuse the second offer. He should not bother at all for the warlike attitude of Russia. The Russian aggression without a provocation would definitely lead to the support of the European nations to the rescue of Turkey. The Sultan of Turkey acted accordingly. He accepted the first condition of the Czar but rejected the second.

When the Czar learnt of the rejection of his second demand, he declared a war upon Turkey. He took possession of the principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia (parts of Roumania) and annihilated a Turkish

Squadron which tried to resist the Russian forces. The European nations tried to avoid a war on large scale and wanted to localize the conflict and then to see its end by discussion. England, Prussia, Austria and France, the four important nations of Europe, presented a proposal called as '**Vienna Note**' by which they asked Turkey to accept the claim of the Russian Czar on the Greek Christian subjects. Russia when intimated of this proposal readily agreed to come to terms. The Turkish Sultan on the advice of the British Ambassador, however, did not agree. He asked the Russian Government to withdraw its forces from the two occupied principalities and at her refusal declared a war.

It is not possible to throw the whole responsibility of the war on either of the two powers, France or Russia. Napoleon III, the French ruler, no doubt wanted a war for his own safety but the role of Russia in the later stages was also dubious. The Russian Government in the later stages had put forward such conditions that no independent power could accept them. The part of the English Ambassador at the court of the Turkish Sultan is also not above condemnation. He wanted to see a trouble.

The Russian forces in the beginning could not face the onslaught of the Turkish regiments which swept away everything that came before them. The Russian victory of Sinope, however, turned the tables of the war and the Turkish defeat and destruction was now a matter of time. France at this stage took up the cause of Turkey. England also joined in and thus there began a true type of war, called in history "The Crimean War".

The allies forces marched upon the Russian regions of Danube and they achieved an easy victory. The Russian forces might have prolonged the war in

the Roumanian regions but for the threatening attitude of the Austrians. The Austrian Government had threatened the Russians with a war if they did not evacuate the Balkan regions, occupied by them with the beginning of the hostility. The struggle after this date was more to humiliate the Russians than to gain any decisive advantage from them. ,

The allies marched upon Sebastopol, the centre of the Russian power in the South. As all the future battles between the Russians and the Allies were fought in the Crimean regions the struggle was given the name of Crimean war. Unfortunately for the allies the campaign was not well managed in the beginning. This resulted in boundless casualties. The Russians had some advantages over their enemies. They were fully acquainted with the lands.

The allies came into conflict with the Russians at **Alma** in 1854. They no doubt defeated the Russians but at a very heavy cost. Their losses were much more than their enemies. The Britishers then attacked the Russian supplies base at **Balaclava** but were defeated. The total number of the British soldiers in this struggle was only six hundred. They attacked the Russians little caring for their lives. Although only one hundred and ninety five soldiers returned yet they immortalized their names by their bravery. It is for this war that Lord Tennyson wrote his famous heroic poem "The Charge of the light brigade".

The English and their allies fought heroically in the other battles too. The Russians again engaged the allies in the fields of **Inkerman** but there they were again defeated too. It was a hand to hand struggle and it is well-known by the name of "the soldier's battle." Finding themselves not strong enough to meet the allies army, the Russians aggravated in every possible way

the troubles of the latter. They paralysed their communication system. The result was that there were no proper facilities for medical aid for the wounded allied soldiers. The multitude of casualties can be guessed by the fact that many thousand more soldiers died in hospitals than on the battle ground. Many more died by the Russian winter.

It was at such a delicate juncture that the world famous Miss Florence Nightingale, not caring for all her luxuries and positions in life, came to the rescue of the wounded and sick. Her marvels cannot be easily forgotten by the human generations who will owe her for ever their gratitude for the nursing services started by her. By her magic energy displayed day and night, noble self-sacrifice, and organising ability she reduced the hospital casualties to be barest minimum. On the other hand the people of England could not tolerate such a high rate of casualties. They agitated and forced Aberdeen to resign. They clamoured for Palmerston in the same way as they had done for Pitt in 1757. Thus Palmerston who a few years ago had been dismissed because of his open sympathies with the revolutionary movements of Europe returned to power with great glory. By his able organising ability he infused a new spirit of self-confidence and energy everywhere. The whole position was changed and England brought for her allies a message of final victory in the war.

The Russians too like the Allies suffered heavy casualties in the Crimean war. The news of the defeat of the Russians broke the heart of Nicholas, the Czar of Russia. He sank to his grave. He was thus saved from the detestable humiliation before the Allies which he never liked. "Thus disappeared one influence antagonistic to peace".

The end of the war was in sight. Sebastopole, the

last hold of the Russians, surrendered in 1855. The back of the Russian resistance was broken. The possibility of a rising in Poland, coupled with their defeats and weak financial position, forced them to request for peace. France thus now got the chance of avenging her defeat.

The war came to an end in 1856 by the **Treaty of Paris**. Its main clauses were :—

1. All the signatory powers acknowledged the rule of Turkey over the Balkan states and thus her integrity.

2. Moldavia and Wallachia which were occupied by the Russians in the initial stages of the war were freed and made self-governing states under the suzerainty of the Sultan. The same concession was given to Serbia as well.

3. The Russians were not to keep their fleet in the Black Sea in future. It was declared neutral and thus saved from becoming a Russian lake.

4. A part of Bessarabia was snatched away from Russia and given to Moldavia. Danube was internationalized and opened to all countries for navigation.

5. The Turkish Sultan promised reforms to his Christian subjects.

Thus there was the end of the 3rd phase of the Eastern Question.

Liberation of Balkan States

For the selfish motives, the European powers, again gave another life to the Turkish Empire in the Treaty

of Paris. Turkey, which had been excluded from Europe by the the Treaty of Vienna, was now readmitted as a potential power of Europe, because of its accepted and guaranteed integrity. The only concession which the Turkish Sultan gave was reforms for his Christian subjects.

The Treaty of Paris had also not solved the Eastern Question. Neither the Turks nor the Russians were sincere in their promises. Although Turkey had promised reforms for her Christian subjects, the fanatic Muslims never wished to enforce any. Russia on the other hand had promised for the integration of the Turkish Empire but was always on the lookout for its disintegration and annexing in herself some parts of the Balkan States. Russia was also anxious to keep her fleet in the Black sea.

On the other hand, Bismarck, the chancellor of Prussia, was thinking of uniting all the German speaking states into one state. In this, he had the help of Austria who had also in its territories some parts where German language was spoken. Bismarck now started his campaign. He asked Denmark to surrender SCHLESWIG and HOLESTEIN, the two German speaking provinces under her domain. On her refusal, the Austrian and Prussian forces marched upon Denmark and freed the two provinces. No other power of Europe took up the cause of Denmark against the joint forces of Austria and Prussia. Prussia and Austria took over administrative control of a state each, but soon there were differences between them. In this struggle those German states which sided with Prussia came automatically under its virtual control. Other states joined Austria. Bismarck now attacked Austria. France, which was now being ruled by Napoleon III was thinking that the war between Austria and Prussia will prolong, and one among them will ask her to help, being their immediate neighbour. In this way, with her help, the side which

will win, will give France some territory. But all this was wishful thinking. Bismarck soon defeated Austria and upset all the French plans. In this way Bismarck was able to unite many of the German speaking provinces into one under the leadership of Kaiser of Prussia.

Bismarck after defeating Austria, offered her very honourable terms. Austria was very much pleased. In fact, this was also a great diplomatic move of Bismarck. His intention was to force out of France, the two German speaking provinces of ALSACE and LORRAINE. He wanted to be sure that in case of a conflict with France, Austria would remain neutral. That is why he befriended a defeated foe by offering her honourable terms.

France, when saw that Bismarck has been able to defeat Austria without her help, asked him price for her neutrality. Bismarck while refusing endorsed a copy of his reply to England stating that Louis Napoleon was trying to become the 2nd Napoleon Bonaparte. England had already learnt a lesson. She became cautious of France when she received Bismarck's letter. In this way Bismarck was able to win over sympathies of English Government and to a great extent could rely on their neutrality in the event of a war between France and Russia.

Napoleon on receipt of Bismarck's reply ordered his forces to be moved on the German borders. Bismarck again by his clever diplomacy interpreted that this move of French forces towards the German borders was not just a mere move but an attack. The Prussians also advanced towards French borders and a clash followed. The move of French which was contemplated to be only a threat, now resulted in an open war. The Prussians inflicted a crushing defeat on the French and

took their King a prisoner. They then occupied Paris. Although Bismarck was sure of the English and Austrian neutrality, he was afraid of the Russian designs. He feared that Russia may not attack the Eastern borders of Germany for her personal ends. He accordingly asked the Czar that as he had defeated his old enemy—France, Russia should avail herself of the opportunity and repudiate the Treaty of Paris. Russia taking this opportunity acted and started keeping her fleet in the Black Sea. She was tempted to do it also because of the indifference of England which being ruled by a peace loving ministry of Gladstone. The question as to why Russia did not annex any part of the Turkish Empire or Bessarabia etc., was, that this would have been minded by Austria and Austria was not going to oblige. And Czar did not wish to estrange relations with Austria.

Thus by keeping away Russia from the German borders—at no cost of his country—Bismarck annexed the two German speaking but French thinking provinces of France—ALSACE and LORRAINE, and also collected a huge amount from France as war indemnity. This slicing of ALSACE and LORRAINE was much minded by the French people and this eventually was one of the chief causes of the 1st world war. To enable him to keep these two provinces, Bismarck was compelled to maintain good relations with its immediate neighbours, Austria and Russia. This led to the formation of the **League of Three Emperors**, viz Kaiser, Czar and Austrian Emperor.

Now Austria and Russia were anxious that the Turkish Sultan should give facilities and reforms to his Christian subjects as promised in the Treaty of Paris in 1856. But the Turkish Sultan was simply putting off the issue. The condition of Christians in Balkan was fast deteriorating. They were being exploited ruthlessly.

Socially they had no status at all and Mohammedans were everywhere the preferred children of the State. Economically they were forced to pay religious taxes and the rate of land revenue which was charged from them was exorbitant. Politically they had no voice at all in the Government. Although they were controlled by their own princes in Balkans, but they were not independent. These princes owed their very existence to the Turkish Sultan. They were utterly helpless. And Sultan was the least interested to introduce any reforms to better the livings of his Christian subjects. Unfortunately bad harvest in HERZEGOVINA and some other parts of Balkans made their condition still worse. They attributed all this present disaster of famine to the foreign rule. The people of Balkans had long been clamouring for independence. They now wanted liberty, equality and fraternity. All this led to an uprising. Russian volunteers poured into Balkans and gave substantial support to this revolt.

But this uprising in Balkans could not be favoured by Austria. Parts of Serbia and Montenegro were under the Austrian domain. In case the Balkan states were made independent, surely Serbia and Montenegro would press Austria to surrender their parts for merger into their present independent states. Andrassy, Austrian foreign minister, consulted the two other members of the '**League of Three Emperors**' and obtained their support to the presentation of a note to the Turkish Sultan demanding the abolition of the system of tax farming and safeguarding cultivators against the tyranny of their landlords. These reforms, it was considered would cut down the uprising and Austria would thus be safe. The British Prime Minister Disraeli intervened and pleaded that some more time should be given to the Turkish Sultan for introducing reforms. On the other hand, he asked the Turkish Sultan to suppress the Balkan revolt with an iron hand. But the policy of Disraeli failed. Eventually Andrassy presented the said note.

The Turkish Sultan who had no intention of introducing any reforms calmly accepted this note and put it aside. When his intentions were known, another rather strongly worded note under the signature of Bismarck, was presented. But this note too joined the fate of the former.

During this period in Turkey itself there was a revolution for the change in Sultanate. Sultan Abdul Aziz was considered to be a weak person. The idealist Turks, who were called the "Young Turks" desired a very strong Sultan who should ruthlessly curb down all the uprisings in Balkans. They also wished that side by side latest inventions etc., should be introduced. They saw their hope in Abdul Hamid II and by a revolution installed him as the new Sultan. The very face of the new Sultan showed that he was a suspicious tyrant. He introduced the railways and the telegraphic system and thus was in a position to command a stricter control over his empire.

The Turkish forces, whom the new Sultan had put on a strong footing, defeated the Serbian and Montenegrins. The Czar, finding no result of his appeals, alone declared war against Turkey. The Russian forces marched upto Constantinople the capital of Turkey. The Turkish forces fought so gallantly and heroically in the battle of Plevna that they won the praise of the whole world. But they were defeated. The Turkish Sultan was thus forced to enter into the humiliating Treaty of SAN STEFANO with Russia.

Treaty of San Stefano.

1. By this treaty a new big state of Bulgaria was created. It was decided that this state would be under the Russian control for the first two years.

2. Roumania, Serbia and Montenegro were declared independent states. The Turkish Sultan was to give these states the necessary territory to enable them to have direct access to the Mediterranean Sea.

3. A part of Bessarabia (Roumania), lost by the Treaty of Paris by Russia was given back to her and she in turn surrendered DOBRUDJA to Roumania. This arrangement was against the wishes of Roumania but Roumania could have no say in the matter as it was with the help of Russia that she was able to get her independence.

4. Turkey promised reforms and surrendered the fort of KARS along with the port of BOTUM and certain other districts of Asia Minor to Russia.

RESULTS

The Treaty of San Stefano gave Russia a unique position. This could not be tolerated by Austria and specially England. The increasing Russian influence clashed with English interests. Disraeli commented that :

- (i) by the creation of a big Bulgaria under Russian influence ;
- (ii) by getting independence for the small states of Serbia and Montenegro, Russia had immensely increased her influence there as these states felt obliged to Russia ;
- (iii) Turkey having been humiliated was also under Russian influence and thus Russia was now all in all on the Eastern frontier of Europe and virtual controller of the Black Sea.

On the other hand, the creation of a big Bulgaria was considered to be a danger by Serbia and Montenegro to their newly won freedom. And they also resented it. Austria too could not tolerate such a big neighbouring state under Russian influence.

Thus Austria and England united. France an old enemy of Russia supported England. Germany a friend of Austria and Russia remained neutral. England asked Russia to produce the Treaty of San Stefano before the European powers for ratification. The Russians at first refused to oblige on the grounds that it was the sole concern of Russia as at the time of war no other European power had helped her. But when the English Government threatened war by mobilizing her Indian troops at Malta, the Czar yielded to the warlike attitude of Disraeli. The Treaty of San Stefano was accordingly brought before the European powers at a Congress at Berlin, under presidentship of Bismarck, for revision.

Russia might have resisted England if Germany had not gave a cold shoulder at that critical time. Germany and Russia were the two members of the 'League of Three Emperors,' organised to check the tides of democracy within Europe, and to lend a moral support to its members in case of their struggle with a democratic government. Russia thus expected the support of Germany against the English armies. Germany hesitated because of the conflicting interests of Austria, the third member of the 'League of Three Emperors', with Russia in the Balkan question. Germany rightly feared the participation of Austria in the struggle from the opposite side. Thus she could not openly take up the cause of Russia.

Bismarck, the chancellor of Germany, whose name was proposed for the presidentship of the coming congress

of the European nations, however, assured Russia that no injustice would be done to her in case she agreed to bring to Treaty of San Stefano for revision before the Congress. He further said that in case some controversy arose he would try to satisfy Russia even if he had to go out of the way for her help. Russia, thus assured, brought the Treaty of San Stefano for revision before the Congress of the European nations.

The Congress held its meetings in the city of Berlin—the capital of Germany and the political capital of Europe for the time, under the presidentship of Bismarck in 1878. England was represented by Disraeli and Salisbury while Gorchakoff represented Russia in the Congress. The Congress in fact met to satisfy the claims of England and Austria, the two important nations of Europe interested in the Balkan question.

Bismarck, by informal meetings with the representatives of the important nations, settled everything before the Congress actually met. In the Congress the decided terms were simply to be brought in black and white. It is sad to note that in spite of all his under hand means and back door policy, which came to the notice of the members of the small states, he declared very loudly in his opening speech that he or his country had no selfish motive and that he was playing the role of an 'Honest Broker.' He denied the charges levied upon him and burst out that his interest in the question was restricted to the maintenance of peace amongst the nations, having conflicting interest in the Balkan question.

Bismarck then brought before the European nations his revised clauses. A single look on the revised clauses could make a person say that it was Pro-Austrian and English Treaty. The independence of Serbia, Roumania, Bulgaria, and Montenegro was acknowledged by the Congress of Berlin.

2. 'Big Bulgaria' against the creation of whom the other Balkan states clamoured, within which Austria found a danger of an equally strong power and England found the insecurity of her Eastern possessions, was divided into three parts. One of its parts called as Macedonia was returned to the Sultan of Turkey. Eastern Roumelia, the second part was given an autonomous position while the third part was allowed to elect its prince who was to be under the nominal suzerainty of the Turkish Sultan. Austria and England perhaps would not have cried against the creation of Big Bulgaria if it had not been under the direct influence of Russia. Russia also would not have minded its division if she had a far-sighted eye. Not only did the Bulgarians later on unite themselves but they also threw away the shackles of Russian slavery and then Russia spoke for division of Bulgaria as decided in the Congress and England and Austria favoured the unification of Bulgaria.

3. England got Cyprus, an island in Mediterranean Sea, from the Turkish Sultan where she kept a strong army to check the Russian advance to the South East and to safeguard her eastern possessions from the increasing shadow of the Russian Bear.

4. The administration of Bosnia and Herzegovina—the two small parts of Serbian nationality—was handed over to Austria.

5. Bessarabia was left with the Russians in spite of the agitations and threats of the Roumanians.

The Congress of Berlin satisfied a few and estranged to too many. Austria and England got their interests satisfied. The other nations, however, in stead of a relief got a further addition to their grievances. The handing over of the administration of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the Austrians in stead of the Serbians was

directly against the principles of nationality. The people of the two states were of the Serbian blood. For the people of the two states there was no difference. They simply changed their masters *i.e.*, from one tyrant—Turkish Sultan, to another tyrant—the Emperor of Austria. The Serbians felt it. They instigated these people for a struggle of independence. They even helped them indirectly. These regions thus never saw peace upto the time of their independence and unification with Serbia. The rivalry between Austria and Serbia over the Bosnian and Herzegovinian question culminated in the murder of the Archduke of Austria which became the immediate cause of the 1st world war.

Gorchakoff, the foreign minister of Russia left the Congress with a very heavy heart. In spite of the declaration of Bismarck that by every possible mean he has tried to satisfy Russia Gorchakoff was heard saying that Bismarck had betrayed the confidence of the Russians which they reposed in him. The Congress cooled the relations between the two countries for some time. Even the Czar wrote a letter of protest to the German Kaiser.

It is true that by the "Re-insurance Treaties" Bismarck maintained friendly relations with the Russians upto 1890 *i.e.*, the year of his dismissal, but it is also not incorrect to say that Germany definitely drifted to the side of the Austrians after the Congress of Berlin and in case of a struggle between Austria and Russia in the near future Germany was to prefer Austria over Russia.

The Congress of Berlin led to the formation of two blocs of rival powers in Europe. Serbia joined Russia, a sworn enemy of Austria, against Austria to get back the regions of Bosnia and Herzegovina from the latter. When the Russians tried to enforce their dictates on

the Bulgarians they were estranged and they now drifted towards Austria to whom they considered their enemies a few years ago. Although in the later stages Roumania joined the Franco-Russian bloc yet in the beginning she joined the Austrians to recapture Bessarabia from the Russians, which the latter had gained by the Treaty of San Stefano and which was confirmed on the latter in the Berlin Congress in spite of the warnings of the former.

The Greeks had a mind to join Russia for gaining further concessions from Turkey during the Russo-Turkish war of 1876. They were, however, prevented by the other European nations who gave a solemn assurance to the Greeks that their genuine grievances would be looked into sympathetically in case of their neutrality during the war. There was no idea to consider the grievances of the Greeks in the Treaty of San Stefano as that was a concern of only two states—Russia and Turkey. The Greeks, however, brought forth their case when the Congress of the European nations met at Berlin. They were put off with scant respect with the remark that as Turkey had already been dismembered to a great extent, it was not possible to deprive her further of her possessions. This led to the estrangement of the Greeks.

The only countries that gained something at the Congress of Berlin were Austria and England. When Disraeli returned to England he was given a rousing reception. In his address to the gathered audience he remarked. "I have brought peace with honour." For the time it seemed to be an amicable settlement as there prevailed peace but the later events proved that it was neither a peace nor an honour. It divided Europe into two armed camps. It was expected that by a base in Mediterranean sea the Eastern possessions would be safeguarded and the Russian advance checked, but it actually did not happen. The Russian danger was felt too near to India on the borders of Afghanistan very shortly.

Even the Balkan Question was not settled amicably. Before the formation of the Congress, the Roumanians only cried for the capture of Bessarabia by the Russians. After the Congress the Bulgarians and the Serbians also became the aggrieved parties—the former because of its division and the latter for the loss of the regions of Bosnia and Herzegovina. It proved to be an unsuccessful attempt to solve the Balkan problem. It led the people to the road of destruction and hastened to the catastrophe of 1914. Thus it would not be incorrect to say that within the Congress of Berlin the seeds of the 1st world war were sown.

The Eastern Question attracted little attention of the English politicians after this date. England throughout the century fought for a cause which did not prove to be a strong cause. She wanted to see the integrity of Turkey and she wanted to see that sick man standing again on his legs who had been lying on his death bed. The Congress of Berlin declared his case hopeless. It was now wrong to cling to his cause. The Congress decided to dispose of his belongings in Europe. England in the meantime purchased the shares of Suez Canal. She established her bases on the borders of Egypt. She kept both the keys to Mediterranean in her hand and thus secured her position in all the Eastern and Western possessions.

Austria and Russia, however, were now the two rival powers in Balkan States contesting for supremacy. Bismarck brought the two rival powers to some settlement by the division of Balkan States into two spheres of influence—Eastern Balkan States for Russia and Western Balkan States for Austria. This policy went on upto 1890 the year of Bismarck's dismissal from the German high office of chancellor. The two nations after that date drew each other nearer to the road of destruction upto the catastrophe of 1914 when they jumped at the throats of one another.

Within Turkey even there was a revolution, popularly known as "Young Turk Revolution", in 1908. The chief object of this revolution was to bring reforms in the Turkish Government and to organise it like the other Western Governments. The Young Turks, who were the educated class of Turkey wanted to save their country from the Europeans. They wanted a strong national Government. In their eyes the question of the Christians of Turkey was a domestic affair of Turkey and no foreign power was justified in its interference. Constitutional monarchy was established as a result of this bloodless revolution and Mohammad V was declared the Sultan of Turkey instead of his despotic brother Abdul Hamid, the then ruler of Turkey.

The new regime in Turkey brought with it untold miseries for the Christian subjects of Turkey. The Christians were treated very badly. They were exploited as well as persecuted. Their risings were suppressed with an iron hand. The slow dissolution of the Turkish Empire, however, went on. Italy took away Tripoli while Austria annexed Bosnia and Herzegovina. The administration of those regions was handed over to her by the Congress of Berlin.

In 1912 there was an other crisis in the history of Balkan States. The Macedonians and the Albanians revolted against the tyrannical rule of the Turkish Sultan. The Young Turks, who were in power crushed the revolt very severely. Thousands of revolutionaries lost their lives. The atrocities of the Turks brought the forces of all the Balkan states on them. The Bulgarians, the Serbians, the Greeks, the Roumanians and the Montenegrans buried their internal jealousies for a while and gave the Turks a united stand. The Turks were defeated and the collapse of the Turkish Empire was so complete that its boundaries now remained restricted to the city of Constantinople.

The war came to an end in 1913 by the **Treaty of London**. Turkey lost everything but its capital and some of its surrounding regions. The Greeks who had not been listened in the Congress of Berlin got Crete. A small Albanian autonomous state was created.

Hardly had the Balkan States turned out their common enemy—the Sultan of Turkey from their regions before an internal jealousy rose up between Serbia and Bulgaria which very soon took up the shape of a war. Bulgaria was in a position to defeat the Serbians but she could not stand the joint forces of the Greeks and the Roumanians which also joined the side of Serbia. Bulgaria was defeated and compelled to surrender all those regions which she gained during the first Balkan War by the Treaty of Bucharest (1913). Turkey, taking advantage of the internal struggles of the Balkanites, again attacked the Balkan regions and recaptured Adrianople and part of Thrace.

The 1st World War gave final blow to the already tottering Turkish Empire and it crumbled to pieces. The Turkish Sultan was thus turned out of Europe with 'Bag and Baggage' and a curtain was laid down on the Eastern Question.

Questions

1. Account for the success of the Greeks in their struggle for independence. (B.A. 1925)
2. What was the trend of the British foreign policy towards the Eastern Question during the Egyptian phase?
3. What were the causes of the Crimean War? Why did the British soldiers suffer at the beginning of this war? (B.A. 1952)

4. Is it correct to say that the Crimean War was a "history of blunders"?

5. What do you understand by the term 'Eastern Question'? What settlement of the question was arrived at by the Treaty of Paris? (B.A. 1915)

6. Argue the cases for and against the policy of the Crimean War (a) as it appeared to contemporaries, (b) as it appears in the light of history. (M.A. 1923)

7. Consider how far Disraeli was justified in claiming to have brought back "Peace with Honour" from Berlin.

8. "At Berlin, we staked the wrong horse." (Lord Salisbury) Elaborate the statement.

9. The Treaty of Berlin of 1878 was a compromise and like all compromises, was pregnant with future troubles.

10. "Within the conference of Berlin were sown the seeds of the first World War." Justify the statement.

11. Trace the history of the Balkan States from 1878 to the peace of Bucharest.

12. The near and Far Eastern policy of England has been directed towards combating Russia's design." Comment.

CHAPTER XV

INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION IN ENGLAND

Thundering and bursting
In torrents, in waves •
Carolling and shouting
Over tombs, amid graves.
See ! on the cumbered plain
Clearing a stage
Scattering the past about
Comes the New Age.

Thus sang **Mathew Arnold** about the new values which were brought into being by the socio-economic convulsions of the later half of the eighteenth and the first quarter of the nineteenth centuries. A series of far-reaching changes in economic relationships of the various factors of production revolutionised the political, social and productive patterns of England in particular, Europe in general and Asia as a corollary. The present is the child of the past. The new theories of Nuclear-fission and the nuclear fusion are, but a stage in the irresistible and irrevocable march of the industrial road-roller.

It is said that, **Arnold Toynbee** first coined the term 'Industrial Revolution' in the year 1884. But the French writer, **Blanqui** had used the term as early as 1837. Later this term was popularised by **Jevons**, **Engels**, and **Karl Marx**.

George W. Southgate has discussed in his *English Economic History*, the implications of 'revolution'. "The word 'revolution' implies a fundamental change; a political revolution is a complete change of government, a diplomatic revolution is an entire rearrangement of international alliances, an agrarian revolution is a change in the technique and organisation of agriculture, a social revolution is a change in the relative importance of certain social classes. Similarly, the Industrial Revolution was a change in industrial method, from handwork to work done by machines driven by power, and in industrial organisation, from work at home to work in factories".

Some writers have questioned the appropriateness of the use of the word 'revolution'. A revolution is often sudden and violent. "The French Revolution of 1789 led to the overthrow of the established monarchy and the rise of the republic. Similarly in Russia in 1917 the old economic order gave place to the new after a violent struggle"¹. The change to which we call 'Industrial Revolution' is spread over a period of about one century, i.e. 1750—1850, and even continued and continues later. It is, therefore, held by some authors that 'Industrial Evolution' would better suit in place of Industrial Revolution. **Birnie** has very rightly pointed out that "the changes which it describes were so far-reaching and profound, so tragic in their combination of material progress and social suffering, that they may well be described as revolutionary. To call them such, at any rate, helps to remind us that the rapidity of economic change during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was greater than in any previous age, and that the price exacted in the shape of social suffering was more than unusually heavy". "If the state of British industry in 1850 be contrasted with

1. *Modern Economic Development of Great Powers* by D. S. Savkar p. 1.

agriculture, while only 5% drew their subsistence from industrial professions. Even agriculture was in the most wretched state because of the primitive techniques employed in it. The disadvantages of the open-field system, absence of fencing, the two-field and three-field systems etc. etc. have already been discussed in another chapter.⁵

Industry in the middle ages was restricted. The modern manufacturing industries, such as cotton, wool, steel hardware, pottery, and glass were non-existent in that era, or at the most can be said to have only insignificant traces. The agricultural population indulged in small scale industrial works in their spare times, and thus got a subsidiary employment for supplementing their scanty incomes. The Roman Catholic church opposed usury and thus acted as a brake on the savings, which can come only by some inducements. Industry in towns was greatly hampered by the restrictions of the guilds. The cottage textile system under which all the members of a family—men, women and children—were engaged in all the process of production—carding, spinning and weaving—had many drawbacks. The work was done irregularly and clothiers—merchant travellers dwelling in towns—suffered great losses. The production under the system was not sufficient to cope with the national and the newly expanding international demand. Not much of capital was required under the system. The question of division of labour did not arise in a family economy.

The form of motive-power was very crude. Machines were driven by water-power, which was inadequate and not dependable. Sometimes there would be overflow of water and at other times scarcity of it will be experienced. In cold weather, the water would freeze and render the industrial operation helpless to be carried

5. See under Agrarian Revolution.

on. According to **H. G. Wells** "The power of the Old World was human power; everything depended ultimately upon the driving power of human muscle, the muscle of ignorant and subjugated men. A little animal muscle, supplied by draft oxen, horse traction, and the like, contributed. Where a weight had to be lifted, men lifted it; where a rock had to be quarried, men chipped it out; where a field had to be ploughed, men and oxen ploughed it."⁶ Steam-power provided a good alternative as the degree of motive force could be controlled in it. With its advent factories began to sprout out in the areas where coal was found.

Gregory King has estimated the national income of England round the year 1700, according to its distribution among the various classes of society, as prevalent at that time. He has put the social-stratification of the time into four. First includes peers, knights and others in upper class. The second and the third can be compared to the middle class of the post-Industrial Revolution era. The fourth constitutes of the menial labourers, cottagers and paupers. The distribution of national income was as follows:

England (1696)

<i>Class of people</i>	<i>Percentage of population</i>	<i>Percentage of income</i>
I	1	14
II	5	17
III	32	47
IV	62	22

The means of transport were merely non-existent, if

6. A Short History of the World p. 271.

we look them from the point of view of our own age, when the world seems to have contracted itself because large distances on land and water can now be covered in no time by land, sea, and air agencies. It was the age of "bullock-cart".

Thus economics in its applied sense, was outmoded. It had outlived its utility. A great jerk was required—rather a rally of jerks was required—to put everything according to its requirements.

In theory also the development lagged behind. Mercantilist-doctrines still held great sway over the policies of the European countries. The views of the mercantilists emerged in a crude form about the end of the fourteenth century, and continued with modifications and refinements, until the second half of the eighteenth century. Europe had changed mightily as a result of the Renaissance, the Reformation, the invention of printing, and above all the discovery of America. In the political arena, medieval tyranny of the barons with shaking kings gave way to the reality of a strong and centralised state with an effective government. Machiavelli advocated in his 'The Prince', the establishment of strong kings. The strength of the king—"the defender of the safety and welfare of the country,"—according to the Mercantilists, depended upon standing army, which in turn required money—in the form of precious metals—to support it. The pursuit of wealth was now noble profession and was "pleasing to God." How is the country to obtain bullion? If it has mines, well and good. In this case the country's task is merely to prevent the silver and gold from flowing to other countries; and if need be by "sanguinary laws", as Adam Smith called them. If a country has no mines, the bullion can only be obtained as a result of trade. A favourable balance of trade must be brought about. "Maximise exports and minimise imports" was the typical

principle of the typical mercantilist. Consequently the country must be a "hive of industry" but its aim should be the needs of other countries. There must be no waste. The nations life should be rationalised. Agriculture as a corollary was the least important profession whereas the most important was trade. Thomas Mun, in England wrote his book "England's Treasures by Foreign Trade" or "The Balance of our Foreign Trade is the rule of our Treasure" "Chop off all imports" was his motto. "It was considered to be the duty of the state to regulate trade, and the state aimed at protecting English industries by bounties and regulations (*e.g.*, Cromwell's Navigation Laws of 1651), and at ensuring a surplus of exports over imports, the difference being paid in cash."

The mercantilist doctrines were based on false assumptions. The later schools of political economy—Physiocrats and **Adam Smith**—criticised the mercantilists downright. Physiocrats put more stress on agriculture, because in agriculture alone was there an element of "net product". Manufacturer, according to them was a hireling of an agriculturist because he did not produce anything but simply converted the forms of the raw-materials. **Adam Smith** also had the stamp of the Physiocrats over his writings and he advocated free-trade.

With this much of background, it is now possible to enumerate in brief, the various inventions which changed the socio-economico-politico-historical face of the earth:

In 1733 **John Kay** gave a start to "The Industrial Revolution" with the invention of a flying shuttle by which the weavers were enabled to weave broader cloth and with a better speed. The out-moded handlooms were replaced by power-looms, worked by water. Later, with the invention of steam power, water-power was also displaced for the use in looms.

In 1767 **Hargreaves** felt the increasing demand of yarn, which arose out of the new-power-looms. The old-fashioned spindles could not cope with the demand. Hargreaves, therefore invented a spinning machine which he christened as "Spinning Jenny".

In 1769, **Richard Arkwright**, a barber of Bolton felt that the Yarn produced by the spinning Jenny was very soft and could not form a wrap. To overcome this difficulty, he invented the water frame which was spun by means of rollers. That spun a hard and firm yarn that could form a wrap and for the first time England began to manufacture pure cotton goods.

Crompton felt that there was no arrangement for spinning finer yarn, so he invented in 1779 a new machine named it after his own name as "**Crompton's Mule**." That machine combined in itself both the advantages of "Spinning Jenny" and Arkwright's "water-frame" and with the help of that machine, he started the manufacture of muslin in England.

These inventions replaced hand looms by power-looms invented by **Cartwright**. These inventions cheapened the manufacture of goods and thus encouraged the English people to lay the foundation of the big cotton industry in England.

Formerly coal was used only for domestic fires. Now onwards, it took the place of char-coal in the iron industry. Due to the scarcity of forests, char-coal as a fuel was very dear. It increased the cost of production of iron and hampered the iron industry. In order to overcome this difficulty. **Derby** in 1709 discovered coke, a product from the coal, that could be used in several processes of iron industry. The invention of coke, which was far cheaper than char-coal, lowered the cost of production of iron to a remarkable degree and

the iron industry very much developed. It may be noted that the first iron bridge was constructed in the year 1777 and in 1790 first iron vessel was made. Iron was used for its main pillars. "By enabling pit coal to be substituted for char-coal as the fuel of the furnace they added at a stroke the extraordinary mineral resources of British coal-fields to the productive wealth of the nation, and called into existence a new, if a black, world in South Wales, the Midlands and Northern Counties of England, and Southern basin of the Clyde. Coal mining, iron and steel, no less than textiles, became the reinforced cement that bonded into a cohesive structure the new industrial empire of Great Britain."⁸

In the beginning of the 18th century animals like the pony and the carts were the only means of transport. The roads were always muddy and occasionally flooded. In winter traffic was practically impossible, ordinary travelling was very much slow and costly. In those days rivers were also used as a means of transport, but the rapid growth of trade and manufacture, expansion of agriculture, the transportation of coal from the mines, raw materials from the ports to the countryside, and manufactured goods from ports to the distant markets necessitated the invention of improved means of transport. Mere rivers could not meet the growing need of commerce and industries. The production of goods on a large scale was of no use as it remained in the factory go-downs to rot there. It could not bear the cost of carriage. To overcome these difficulties men like Blind Jack of knaresborough, an uneducated but practical genius, were pioneers ; but the application of engineering science as distinct from a felicitous empiricism came much later with Telford, Macadam, and their school. **Duke of Bridgewater**, who owned a large number of mines in Worsley and who had to send his coal from his mines to different parts of the country, engaged

8. England Under the Hanoverians by C. Grant Robertson P. 333

James Brindley, a clever engineer. In 1761, he constructed the first canal between Worsley and Manchester and Liverpool. The cost of transport of coal was very much lowered and there was speedy movement of stocks of coal from one place to another. Being encouraged by the success of Bridgewater, many canal companies came into being all over England and constructed many canals.

Then came the age of Road Construction. **Telford** and **Macadam**, two pioneers, invented a new method of making roads. This invention of making roads changed the form of travelling conditions in as much as the same distance could be covered in a very little time as compared with those of muddy and often flooded roads. From 1802 to 1820 Telford constructed 920 miles of good roads with 1200 bridges.

"It will be noticed too that in this wonderful epoch Great Britain owed little to foreign help. The most striking results are the products of British brains and energies: and in the long list the place of honour belongs to **James Watt**, one of the finest and most fertile scientific minds that our (England) country has produced".⁹ The invention by which he transformed the atmospheric machine of **Newcomen** and others into a steam engine was theoretically completed in 1765. But the discovery was turned to practical use very late. *i. e.* after his partnership with Mathew Boulton. "The alliance of a genius in mechanics with a genius in business inaugurated the age of steam"¹⁰ Consequently, the steam power was rapidly applied to, and finally conquered, the industrial world. Steam pumps and hammers were followed by steam mills for sawing, sugar, flour, silk, cotton and wool.

9. Ibid, p. 334.

10. Ibid.

In 1814 Stephenson invented locomotive engines to use steam to pull wagons on wooden or iron rails. In 1825 the Stockton and Darlington Railway was opened for passengers.

The development of Industrial Revolution has been summed up in six stages by Mr. Knowles :—

(a) **Development of Engineering :** Engineers were required to make and repair engines, to make machinery for the textiles, to make machinery for lifting coal out of the pit, to make machine-tools and locomotives. The only engineers before the middle of the 18th century were men who repaired the mechanism of the flour mills and the iron workers who were blacksmiths. Engineers now had to learn while earning.

(b) **Revolution in iron making** preceded the machinery. The iron-works in both England and France before 1780 were scattered all over the country, near woods to get char-coal for smelting and near water for power and transport of bulky awkward articles like iron and steel. Now onwards iron foundrymen were able to concentrate and develop on a large scale because there existed a large demand of iron owing to war and the existence of steam engine enabled them to free themselves from the limitations of water power.

(c) **The application of mechanical devices in spinning and weaving,** moved by water or steam-power to the textiles including cotton, wool, flax and silk.

(d) **Creation of great chemical industries :** The bleaching, dyeing, finishing or printing processes had all to be accelerated or transformed to keep pace with the output of the piece goods and this meant the creation of the great chemical industries.

(e) **Great development of coal-mining** : Engineering, iron-founding, textile machinery and industrial chemistry all hinged ultimately on coal. Coal was needed to refine the iron into the form in which it was required by the engineers ; it was needed for the new motive-power—steam. Coal in such large quantities had been impossible to obtain without a steam engine, devised by engineers, which pumped water out of the mines.

(f) Last but not least was the **development in the means of communications**. Communications facilitated the movement of food to feed the population gathered round the coal and iron industrial areas. It enabled the transference of vast quantity of ores, fuel and raw materials, cotton, wool, oils, fibres, timber and chemicals required to feed the factories. It was also instrumental in distributing the vast bulk of the manufactured articles. Due to the expansion of the markets, law of increasing returns could be utilised to produce more at reducing costs.

“Each of the inventions” says **Knowles**, depended in turn on the others and the reason for their spread in the nineteenth century lies in the fact that they all reached a point in the eighteenth century, where they could be utilised together so that they reacted on and stimulated each other.

Now the question that poses itself is as to ‘why did the Industrial Revolution first come in England’? There are multifarious political, social, theological, commercial, geographical and economic reasons for it.....British political and financial stability were the two biggest factors. The Revolution Settlement followed by the Glorious Revolution decided once for all the sovereign body in the country was not to be the King but King-in-Parliament. The later Jacobite risings merely died their unmarked deaths. The wars of the time, in which England was also

involved, were fought on the continent, or on the sea, or in Asia or in America. Due to this political security people did not hesitate to sink their money in the fixed form, which is necessary for large-scale enterprises. "The understood capital; they understood large scale production; and they knew that they would reap where they had sown" France and not England, would have headed the flag-past of industrial revolution in textile industry if French Revolution had not put back her clock by a period of at least one generation.

The disappearance of serfdom in England earlier than in any other European country brought freedom to the populace to move out to the newly emerging industrial towns. In France, for example, there was a "class-out-of-bounds professions" so that agriculturists had to cling to the agriculture, come what may.

Capital commanded a great importance in England. Trading companies of England brought huge profits to their country. Mercantilists advocated the investment of this money in manufacturing industries. "Capital was accumulated, also, as the result of abstinence and frugality practised from religious motives. In this connection the influence of Puritanism in the seventeenth century, and of Methodism in the eighteenth, was appreciable. Indulgence in worldly pleasures was frowned upon, but success in business was regarded as the normal consequence of a devout way of living. "Heaven is not dumping-ground for the failures of earth¹¹," This accumulated capital was available for investment in the industry.

Capital would not have been well-utilised but for a sound financial and banking system of the country. Financial brains, like that of Walpole, have earned the gratitude of the posterity in England for their sound financial policies.

11. Southgate p. 130.

France, with her larger exports and imports had sufficient capital, but the absence of banking institutions was responsible for keeping apart the two sets—of capital holders and the investors.

Nature had perhaps cast England specially in the mould for being an industrial country. The natural advantages enjoyed by her on account of her geographical position and the existence of iron and coal ores remain unsurpassed till now. Its position on the "outskirts of Europe at the head of the Atlantic and commanding the approach to Northern Europe,"¹² gave her the unrivalled opportunity for selling in foreign markets. Lack of coal was a serious handicap for France, whereas in England the "vast supplies of coal and iron, in close proximity to each other and to the coast, were vital to industrial development."¹³ Her climate was invigorating, her seas navigable, and her coast offered excellent harbours.

French Revolution had much to do with the industrial decline of France. France had earlier a great industrial tradition, an industrious and numerous population, large markets at home and abroad, great reputation for their productivity and a mature inventive genius. France no doubt lost important colonies to England but, her colonial trade in 1787 was still higher than that of England. But for the French Revolution American trade with France would have developed enormously as America was, at that time, at daggers drawn with England. "As a result of the French Revolution, war broke out between Great Britain and France in 1793; the English cut off the French overseas trade and this readjustment of commercial relations could not take place."¹⁴ The Revolution put France back by about forty years and by the time she came

12. Knowles.

13. Southgate P. 131.

14. Knowles.

had come to power only a year ago, finding the position critical, withdrew the reform bill and dissolved the Parliament with a view to fighting the elections, making the issue of reform of the Parliament as their basic programme. The reform movement was so strong that the slogans of 'The bill, the whole bill and nothing but the bill' could be heard in all parts of the country and the eagerness for the reforms could be well imagined from the fact that the Whigs fought elections on the basis of reform bill and returned to the Parliament with an overwhelming majority.

The bill was again introduced in the House of Commons by Lord Grey after slight modifications. It was passed by the House of Commons. It was then sent to the House of Lords but was rejected as the members there were strongly opposed to the bill because it was they who had to suffer great losses in the case of the bill becoming an act. At the rejection of the bill in the House of Lords, riots broke out in different parts of England. Macaulay at this time in his famous speech in the parliament declared "The Public enthusiasm is undiminished. Old Sarum has grown no bigger. Manchester has grown no smaller.....I know only two ways in which societies can be governed—by public opinion or by sword. A Government having at its command the armies, the fleets, the revenues of Great Britain might possibly hold Ireland by the sword;.....but to govern Great Britain by the sword, so wild a thought has never occurred to any public man of any party..... In old times, when ~~the~~ villains were driven to revolt by oppression, when a hundred thousand insurgents appeared in arms on Black Heath, the King rode up to them and exclaimed, "I will be your leader," and at once the infuriated multitude laid down their arms and dispersed at his command. Herein let us imitate him. Let us say to our countrymen, 'We are your leaders. Our lawful power shall be firmly exerted to the utmost in your cause; and our lawful power is such that it must finally prevail.'"

Lord Grey resigned on the rejection of the bill and William IV invited Duke of Wellington to form ministry. Wellington, who, a few years ago, was the most popular man of the country, to-day was not in a position to command a majority of vote in the House of Commons and thus failed to form a ministry. The king again called upon Grey but the latter refused and was ready only when the king promised that in case of House of Lords' opposition to the bill the king would create new peers to out-vote the members of opposition to the bill. The bill was thus again passed in the House of Commons and was sent to House of Lords. Duke of Wellington was thinking of opposing the bill. But the matter of creating 50 peers was brought to his knowledge. This brought him to senses and on the day of discussion of the bill he together with his followers abstained from voting and the bill was thus passed and became an act.

Its main clauses were :—

All those constituencies where the number of the voters was less than two thousand were deprived of their right of sending a member to the House of Commons.

All those constituencies where the number of voters ranged from two thousand to four thousand were allowed to send only one member in the House of Commons and those constituencies where the number of voters was above four thousand were allowed to elect two representatives for the House of Commons.

As for the qualifications of the voters all those copy-holders who were holding a land worth of 10£ a year or 50£ a year by lease in the counties were allowed to vote for the parliament, while in the boroughs all those house-holders who were paying an annual rent of 10£ were permitted to vote for the Parliament.

One hundred and forty three seats fell vacant as a result of this new system of representation. They were divided among the big cities, counties and newly populated localities of the North. Eight and five more seats were given to Scotland and Ireland respectively. People living in towns and cities also got some concessions.

By the Reform Act of 1832, the powers which were, previously in the hands of the Aristocratic classes now shifted to the middle classes. There were still many restrictions on the system of voting and several qualifications were still necessary for a voter, but it was surely a step towards democracy as half a million Englishmen had been given the right of voting as a result of the Reform Act of 1832. The poor wage-earners, who day and night agitated for this Reform Act, were not allowed to express their opinions. This reformed Parliament was unable to redress their grievances. They showed their resentment and discontent in the form of Chartist Movement and Corn Law Leagues. The Reform Act was in fact a compromise between the Aristocratic class and Common masses, It was as has been nicely summarised by a certain English Author a compromise between Aristocracy and Democracy.

Reform Act of 1867.

The discontentment which prevailed in England as a result of the long Revolutionary Wars, had been responsible for the Reform Act of 1832. The Act had not in reality been a remedial measure for the poor wage-earners who agitated for representation in the Parliament for bringing forth their grievances against their employers who exploited them. It was more in the nature of "a compromise between Aristocracy and Democracy." The power went out of the hands of the Aristocratic class and it came to the middle class.

The poor factory workers and the peasants remained in the old state of affairs. The Industrial Revolution had converted them from independent artisans into mere wage-earners and they were now wholly dependent on their employers. The employers never cared for their betterment. The peasants similarly were in a wretched condition. There was a lot of competition in the market. It resulted in a mass unemployment and thus the lowering of wages to a great extent. A desire for more gains rose in the minds of rich landlords of the South who saw their class-men—the factory owners—earning a huge profit. They would have more gains only if the price of the corn had gone very high. So they asked the Government to increase the price of the corn. They threatened that if the price was not raised they would also convert their lands into factory areas.

England as a result of the Industrial Revolution had already got a change in its nickname from 'a granary of the North' to a 'workshop'. It was now partly depending on the other countries for its corn. The conversion of the rest of the lands into factory areas would completely lead to dependence of England on the foreign corn which was too risky in the days of war. The Government thus in order to satisfy the land-owning class, had imposed duties on the imported corn. The measure was known as 'Corn laws.' This satisfaction of the land owning class had further increased the troubles of the poor wage-earners and the peasants. There were agitations in every part of the country but these brought no relief.

The middle class men, which came in power in 1832 as a result of the agitation of the lower class people, were now placed in a very awkward position. They did not know how to face the situation. The opposition of the representatives of the Aristocratic class in the Parliament compelled them not to entertain any of those demands of the demonstrators. Many a time, the movement for the removal of the corn laws proved irresistible. Chartist

Movement kept the Government in a very uneasy position for a petty long time. These agitations had brought forth the glaring defects of the representation system and no body could deny the fact that the English Parliament was not the true representation of the English people. These agitations could not deter, Lord Palmerston, one of the most popular men of the time, from his ideology and he did not believe in terms of the people. Although a great revolutionary abroad, yet he remained conservative at home. Reform Act of 1832, according to him was just according to the needs. Any further reform would be in advance of its times. The removal of the corn laws during the ministry of Sir Robert Peel gave a relief to the chartists for a while.

Lord Palmerston, the greatest opponent to the reforms, died in 1865. With his death there was sounded the death-knell of the middle class supremacy which it was enjoying in spite of the fact that it was not the true voice of the hour. The Whigs under the guidance of Lord Russell and a young leader Gladstone formed their Government. In order to meet the need of the time they introduced a bill for the reform of the Parliament. The bill was introduced in a hot haste so it met its end before its time. It was to bring down the qualification of a voter in a borough from £10 house-holder to £7 house-holder. Within the county the qualification for a voter was to be reduced from £50 to £14.

The bill was not liked by any of the two parties. The Conservatives, as was but natural, were to oppose any measure brought in by the Whigs especially on the question of some concessions to the voters for the Parliament. The Whigs opposed it because it had nothing revolutionary. After such a long protracted struggle. They were not going to be satisfied with such a moderate type of reforms. Thus it was opposed by one group for its leaning to a more democratic Parliament and by the other because that found no true concessions in its clauses. Russell who

had a long record of an upholder of reforms within the country, thus resigned, making a seat for the Conservatives to succeed him to power.

The Conservatives were actually not in a majority in the House of Commons. It was division within the Whig rank which had given them a chance to form a Government. Derby Disraeli coalition thus came into power. It took up the question of the reform of the Parliament—the pressing need of the time. The opposition of Lord Palmerston had been responsible for making the giant of Reform to go in a very deep sleep. The introduction and then rejection of a bill for the reforms awoke the volcano which had been in sleep. The whole of the country was ablaze. Since the beginning of the Revolutionary war England had never seen so much agitation for the reforms. Many prominent leaders were backing the movement. It was under these circumstances that Disraeli introduced a bill for reform of the Parliament. He simply introduced a topic. The decision concerning the concessions he left for the House of Commons. Many heated debates followed. Disraeli created such an atmosphere that the bill became a question of all the parties. In the meanwhile there broke out riots within the country which still more hastened the final decision over the question. Disraeli was to please his party as well as the opposition which was in reality not in a minority. He, on the one hand by his series of resolutions, stressed upon the need of giving more concessions to the labouring class and by his policy of checks and measures he withdrew them on the other hand. His policy was not to allow any class to gain a decided supreme position in the House of Commons. The Liberals saw through the clauses the cunningness of Disraeli and they criticised his policy. His reform bill was similarly not appreciated by the Conservatives who found within his move a step towards democracy. Disraeli, however, was not going to give way to despair and to abandoning the scheme. He now came forward with a still larger scheme.

Some of the members of his Cabinet, no doubt, left him at this change of policy but he felt a great relief as he was now in a position to act more independently than before.

He declared that his policy was to lower the franchise in boroughs as well as counties and thus to see the Parliament to be a more represented body. The following were the concessions :—

1. Every house-holder what-so-ever was given the right of vote but on the condition of his having resided at the place at least for two years.

2. In the counties all the £15 house-holders were to be given the right of the vote.

3. All those boroughs, where the population was ten thousand or less than it, were disfranchised.

4. As the above two concessions were to shift the power to the working class, Disraeli brought in some reactionary measures as well. Those clearly show that he was not at all sincere to the working class. By 'Fancy Franchises' system the university degree—holders clergymen and some other people were given a special right to vote. It was proposed that the person who has the double qualifications, *i.e.*, who is a house-holder as well as a university degree-holder, may be given the double right of voting. It was a very clever policy of Disraeli. The working class in spite of the fact that they got the right of vote was to remain in minority under the new policy. Gladstone, who at a time had been outvoted over a similar and, indeed, a frank bill free of all these complications, denounced the bill as "full of mischief" and declared that the right of double vote to a class would lead to a struggle within the country. He warned the party in power that such discriminations and differences between man and man in the later stages would lead to a depressed class revolution.

As mentioned before Disraeli did not command a majority in the House of Commons. He thus could not face any opposition and in order to see his bill an act he was ready to make every amendment within the original document. There were thus brought so many changes that the bill now seemed to be nothing but something like a dictation of Gladstone.

The following were the main clauses of the Act of 1867.

1. All the House-holders having resided at least for a year in the house were given the right of vote. Even the right of vote was extended to the people who paid a rent of £10 a year.

2. £12 house-holders of the counties got the right of a voter. The English tenant farmers community thus as a whole got the right of voting.

The counties were given 25 more seats and there was the addition of about 75,000 voters in the list of the electorate after this concession.

As for the importance of the Act we can say that it partly completed the work of the Act of 1832. In the Act of 1832 there had been a compromise between Aristocracy and Democracy and the power had been shifted to the middle class men. Now there was noticed further change. The power came down a step further and the place of the middle class was taken by the working class. The house-hold suffrage was a great step towards Democracy. The agitations of the working class had at last produced its results.

Members of Liberal party were taken aback at this revolutionary move of Disraeli—that Disraeli, who a year ago had successfully opposed a very moderate move of Gladstone for the reforms. Disraeli was criticised by many

as a 'betrayed of his party' like Sir Robert Peel. They reposed their confidence in him but he betrayed them. But one thing note worthy within the move was its successful introduction and passing through both the Houses. Whereas Peel over Corn Law brought a complete dead-lock in his party and led to its scattering into small fragments, Disraeli even after a betrayal kept it in tact and made it still stronger. The move of Disraeli was quite unexpected for many. While the Liberals themselves could not get passed a far moderate measure from the House. He got it passed successfully although Derby, the then Prime Minister, went on giving the move the name of "a leap in the dark".

Reform Act of 1884

The Reform Act of 1867 by its famous 'household suffrage' gave to every workman within the borough the right to vote for the Parliament. Such type of right, however, remained restricted to the boroughs. The agricultural labourers of the counties had to go without such privilege upto 1884 when Gladstone extended similar concessions which were previously given to the boroughs only, to the counties as well. Gladstone during his election campaign in the counties was approached by the poor agriculturists for the right of vote. They, indeed, had a very poor lot. They were to remain poor although there might be prosperity and peace in the country, as they were concerned merely with their wages which were very low. He gave them word that if he came in power he would definitely remove the disabilities of those agriculturists. He came out successful in the elections and now introduced in 1884 a bill in the Parliament for concessions to the counties similar to those of the boroughs. The bill was passed by a majority of vote in the House of Commons but the House of Lords showed some reluctance in its approval. In the House of Lords the majority of the Members were of the Conservative party.

They soon got an excuse to reject it. They declared that so long there was no redistributions of the seats, they would not approve it. Gladstone, a very reasonable man, appreciated their point of view and intimated the Lords that as it was not within his policy to introduce two bills at a time, he would be very shortly afterwards introducing the second bill as well. The House of Lords got their excuse and informed the Prime Minister that the Bill could only be approved if it was sent with the bill of the redistribution of seats at the same time. This estranged the relations; and the question by both the Houses was taken quite in a different colour. The Prime Minister when once informed the House of Commons about the attitude of the Lords there were uproars in the Parliament. The country-wide cry questioning the necessity and power of the House of Lords could be heard. At this critical stage the Queen interfered. As a result of her mediation the approval of the Bill was agreed upon by the House of Lords. The Prime Minister made a solemn assurance that he would immediately after the approval introduce the bill for the redistribution of seats proportionately. The following were the provisions of the Reform Act of 1884 :—

1. All the house-holders in the counties were given the privilege of vote. The right of vote was further extended to those people who were paying an annual rent of £10. The right of vote was given even to some other persons who did not come under the above two categories but were otherwise qualified for the right.

2. By the provisions of the Re-distribution Act of 1885, it was agreed upon that all those boroughs where the population was less than 15,000 may be deprived of the right of sending a member to the House of Commons. Boroughs with less than the population of 50,000 but with more than 15,000 could send one representative to the House of Commons. The raising of the population led to the

establishment of single-member constituency in the whole of the country.

The Act of 1884 was another great step towards democracy. It brought the working men and agricultural labourers on the same level and thus brought an end to the agitation which was being carried on by the agricultural labourers against the distinction made by the Reform Act of 1867. The lot of the poor agricultural labourer was very hard. He was completely at the mercy of his Lord. He had no voice in the Parliament. The Act of 1884 acquainted him with the Parliament where he could now propound his grievances against his Lord. There was an increase of about two million voters in the list of electors as a result of this Act. The Parliament now became a true representative body. Now all the classes had the right to vote for the Parliament.

Reform Act of 1911

The rejection of the Budget by the House of Lords led to a great uproar in the House of Commons. There was a cry from every corner of the House of Commons which questioned the position of the Lords. Similar position was created in the Parliament when the majority of Lords led by Duke of Wellington had rejected the first reform bill. The intervention of the King, however, had smoothened the matter and when the party of the Duke remained absent in the next discussion there was an end of the rivalry between the two Houses.

There was an other similar type of experience in 1884 when the Lords refused to pass the Reform Bill of 1884 until and unless there was not brought in side by side the Re-distribution Bill. Queen Victoria at that time saved the situation.

When in 1909 the Lords again followed their past dangerous and provoking policy the Liberal Ministry of Asquith was not going to let them escape without some punishment. There was a move from every quarter to deprive the House of Lords of its powers which it always misused. Some of the extremists went up even to the extent of saying that it should once for all be abolished. The House of Commons, however, took a considerate step and passed a resolution by which the House of Lords in future could not reject the bill sent by the Lower House. The Lords were not to pass it under any circumstances peacefully as it was a bill directly affecting their own position. They thus delayed its approval. This again led to a great excitement in the House of Commons which now approached the King and asked him to create new Peers to out-vote the members of the House of Lords over the bill in question. When the Lords found the situation worsening they gave up opposition to the Bill. Many of them remained absent on the day when it was to be re-introduced. It was approved and thus it became an Act called 'the Act of 1911'. The following were its main provisions:—

1. The elections of the Parliament were to be held after every five years. There was a time when the elections used to be held after every three years. The Septennial bill, by which life of the House of Commons was increased to seven years, had been passed during the Whigs period. It was passed to lessen the chances of the Tories to come to power.

2. By the second clause of the Act it was declared that all the money bills which got the majority of votes in the three consecutive meetings of the House of Commons were to be considered something approved and final, the House of Lords may give its sanction to it or not. The House of Lords also could not alter a money bill. It was, however, given the power to delay a bill for a period of two years from becoming an Act. It was in reality

to ensure the correctness and justifiability of a bill. During the period of its delay both the Houses could again re-consider their respective case and suggest some amendments.

The Act of 1911 completed the task of the Bill of Rights. While the Bill of Rights had ensured the supremacy of the Parliament over the Crown, the Act of 1911 declared the supremacy of the representatives of commons over the House of Lords. The House of Lords had been a great eye-sore for the common people of the country owing to its unlimited powers. It had been a great check on the democratic movement within the country. The Act of 1911 broke its power and declared the House of Commons as the real "Sovereign power in the State". The Act, as is clear from the second clause, gave to the House of Commons all powers concerning the finances as all the Bills of money were to have their origination in the House of Commons. Even the Lords could not make alterations in them.

Act of 1918 and 1928

During the nineteenth century the men of all occupations by slow stages gained the right to vote for the Parliament. Similar concession was not extended to the woman, as they were considered inferior to men. When there was brought in a motion for extending similar privileges to the women there was quite a good scene in the House. People laughed at the idea. The 20th century, however, brought with it a change in the attitude of men towards the women folk. The women came out of their secluded position. By their work in the 1st World War they proved beyond doubt that they were in no way inferior to men. They equally played an important role; so after the world war the opinion of men about them was changed.

In 1918 there was brought within the House of Commons a bill for extending the right of vote to the women as well. It was passed and it was given the name of Act of 1918. By the act all those women who were above the age of 30 years were given the right to vote for the Parliament. The women, however, resented the still prevailing difference between men and women. Because all men above the age of 21 had the similar right. The Act of 1928 removed this grievance as well and all those women who were above the age of 21 got the right to vote for the Parliament.

By the passing of these Acts England became in the true sense a democratic country. There was universal suffrage and every grown up person now could call the Government his/her representative.

Questions

1. What defects in the system of parliamentary representation was the Reform Bill (1832) intended to remedy? In what ways was it not a final settlement? (B.A. 1952)
2. Trace very briefly the history of Parliamentary Reforms in the nineteenth century. (B.A. 1951, 49, 45)
3. Summarise the history of the extension of Parliamentary franchise in the victorian era.
4. "The Acts of 1867 and 1884 completed the work left behind by the Act of 1832". Do you agree.
5. Examine the effects of the successive extension of franchise in the nineteenth century upon the personnel of the House of Commons. (M.A. 1923)

CHAPTER XVII

OUTSTANDING PERSONALITIES OF THE 19TH CENTURY ENGLAND

Lord Castlereagh (1812—22).

Lord Castlereagh was one of the most prominent personalities of the nineteenth century. He overshadowed the first ten years of the Liverpool Ministry, from 1812 to 1822, as a Foreign Minister. He was one of those personalities of England who saved the country at a very critical time. Napoleon was out to humiliate the "nation of the shopkeepers", as he called the Britishers. By his Continental System, he tried to close all the European ports to the British goods and he did achieve some success in his policy in the beginning. The Britishers were bewildered. It was only the unshakable rock-like Castlereagh who still stood for his principles.

When he came to know of the designs of Napoleon, he retaliated and declared that all those nations of Europe which will co-operate with Napoleon will be considered hostile towards England. England will, therefore, have the right to destroy their ships whenever they are seen on the seas. The Europeans were between the two fires. They could neither dare offend Napoleon nor could they live without the British goods. They were now accordingly on the lookout of a secret outlet through which they might be in a position to smuggle British goods.

Had Napoleon been successful in his policy, England would have definitely been ruined, Only Castlereagh's dauntless courage and retaliatory measures did not allow him to succeed and led to many complications for him. Castlereagh in fact was a dictator in Europe and his policy being successful, he was fully supported by all the classes.

The abdication of Napoleon in 1814 led to the re-arrangement of the borders of European countries. A conference of the European nations was held at Vienna. Castlereagh was one of the most important figures in this conference. The Congress of Vienna, however, had to stop short when Napoleon re-appeared in France during the next year. Castlereagh ordered the British forces to meet the aggression boldly. Thus was fought at Waterloo one of the most important battles of the nineteenth century between the English and the French. Napoleonic Wars once for all came to an end. There was now the opening of a new era in the history of Europe.

Castlereagh had proved himself a very successful foreign minister in the matters of war. In the matters of peace, however, he could not be very successful. The Czar of Russia formed a Holy Alliance with Austria and Prussia for the suppression of democratic ideas in Europe. But Castlereagh did not join it on principle as this was against the ideals of democracy which was prevalent in England.

Castlereagh, who was desirous of having peace in Europe, formed another league with those countries, but on principles of peace. He declared that the policy of England was to help the European nations in the settlement of their internal problems. While the policy of England was not to interfere in the internal affairs of any state, she was always ready to help them for the settlement of their mutual disputes.

Austria and Russia, two great European powers, were at daggers drawn over some German State question and the Balkan question. The Austrian Chancellor, Metternich, wanted to enforce despotic principles over the small German States which were indirectly under his control, as the Austrian King was the leading member of these small German States Republic. Being an upholder of despotic principles, he asked the European nations to co-operate with him for the suppression of the agitation going on in Germany for constitutional liberty. Castlereagh opposed him and thus did not allow the European powers to make a joint attack on the aggrieved nationalities of Central Europe.

The people of France were not allowed to send any representative to the Congress of the European Nations because of their revolutionary tendency. Later on the French people, by a peace of three years from 1815 to 1818, proved that they were also equally desirous of peace. Thus, in the Conference of AIX LA CHAPELLE it was decided that the French should also be given their old position in the political affairs of Europe. With the joining in of the French, the League of Peace formed by Castlereagh, became a league of five nations.

In the meantime, there sprang up many problems in Europe. The Austrians in Italy were facing hostile Italians who wanted to attain independence from the Austrians. The Spanish Government was also constantly afraid of the democratic rising within the country. There was another knotty question raising its head in the Eastern Europe which perplexed the brains of the European politicians of the century. It was the Eastern Question. The Balkans, inspired by the principles of democracy and the watchwords of French Revolution, *i.e.*, Liberty, Equality and Fraternity, wanted to regain their independence. Russia was placed in a very awkward position. As a Patron of the Greek Church, she was supposed to take up the

cause of the Greeks when they revolted against the Sultan of Turkey, but as an upholder of the despotic ideals, she was to oppose the national rising in Greece.

All these problems crept up at a time when all the European powers were anxious to make an amicable settlement. A Conference of the European Nations was called at Verona in 1822 and Castlereagh was to represent the British Government. At this stage, the position of Europe was very critical. If any of the Problems remained unsolved, it was bound to disturb the peace of Europe. But, unfortunately, Castlereagh committed suicide at this critical juncture and thus left Canning, his successor, to tackle these problems.

Lord Canning (1822—27).

Lord Canning was the Foreign Minister of England from 1822 to 1827. He was one of those few personalities of the English History who spoke for revolutionary ideas in spite of the destruction which had been brought about in Europe by the French Revolution. He was a great enemy of Castlereagh. They were poles apart in their policies. Castlereagh has been painted as a person of aristocratic ideas while Canning up to this day is remembered as a great patron of revolutionary ideas.

Castlereagh committed suicide in 1822 and Canning succeeded him. Canning had all sympathies for the European Revolutionists but he could not run the risk for them. The lot of the common people of England was very poor. They were passing through the most critical period of their history. The country was facing an economic crisis. The people were disgusted with the imperialistic policy. The war stricken humanity was looking in all directions for the Apostle of peace. Under these circumstances a bold imperialistic policy abroad was

very risky. Canning was, however, not ready to yield before the despotic powers of the Eastern Europe. He strongly opposed the Holy Alliance formed between Russia, Prussia and Austria to check the democratic ideas amongst the European nations.

There was a revolt in the Spanish South American Colonies against their blood-thirsty ruler. Russia and her allies wanted to take up the cause of Spain but they could not in view of Lord Canning's strong opposition. Canning even went a step further. He instigated the North American Colonies and asked them to help their friends of the South in achieving their independence from the yoke of the Spanish Ruler. Canning said, "I called the new world into existence to redress the balance of the old".

Canning was once placed in a tight corner due to his dual role of a politician and an upholder of the revolutionary ideals when the Greek War of Independence was being fought. As a revolutionary, he was supposed to take up the cause of the Greeks, but as a politician he was to maintain the integrity of Turkey. His policy at this stage was not very daring. While he gave his lip sympathy to the Greek War of Independence by encouraging the independence loving people of England and Europe for taking up the cause of Greeks, he was neutral in his governmental policy. The war took a turn in favour of the Turkish Sultan when he secured the help of the Egyptian Viceroy, Mehmet Ali. All European Nations thereupon took up the cause of the Greeks. Although it was for a very short time, it greatly helped the Greeks to recover from the onslaught of the despotic Sultan. Canning, who died in 1827, could not see the end of the war during his life time. It ended in 1829 when the Duke of Wellington was in power. Canning's indirect support to the Greeks has been accredited by all the writers.

Canning, although only a foreign minister in the Liverpool Ministry, was in fact the real authority within the country. His services to England, even before he took up the portfolio of the Foreign Affairs, were very much appreciated. As a Secretary of War Affairs, he had organised the Peninsular War. He was a great orator and also wrote beautiful verses. One of his verses which was well known within the political circles of England runs as follows :—

“As London is to Paddington
So Younger Pitt is to Addington.”

The Duke of Wellington

The Duke of Wellington, whose original name was Arthur Wellesley was the greatest general, which the history of England had ever produced. Born and brought up in a rich family, he joined military forces after getting his education.

Young age of 24 saw him a Lieutenant Colonel and he was then sent to India where his elder brother Lord Wellesley had been working as a Governor General under the British East India Company.

During his stay in India he distinguished himself as a soldier during the Fourth Mysore War and the 2nd Maratha War. These were only the basis which had been laid down during his service in India and he was, in fact, to do a lot during his wars against Napoleon—the child of the French Revolution.

During the Napoleonic Wars, the people of Portugal revolted against the Continental System of Napoleon. Sir Arthur Wellesley, as was called the Duke of Wellington

in those days, was sent to Portugal to take up the cause of its people. He fought very bravely and although many a time he had to retire to the sea under the pressure of the French armies yet he later on carved out such a nice position for himself that even Napoleon at a time had to return disappointed from the regions of Portugal. The absence of Napoleon in Russia and the national rising of the Spanish people gave a chance to Wellesley to show his mettle on the field. He defeated the French from stage to stage and there came a day when Sir Arthur Wellesley was in a position to write to the Home Government that he had liberated the whole of Spain. He continued his progress in France, when Napoleon surrendered unconditionally.

Napoleon escaped from Elba and recaptured the throne of France. The people of France hailed him as their Emperor. It was a critical time for the European nations and especially for England of which Napoleon was a sworn enemy. Arthur Wellesley was despatched against him. The two great generals met on the field of Waterloo. Napoleon was defeated and was imprisoned at St. Helena for the rest of his life. This victory further enhanced the prestige of Sir Arthur Wellesley who after his return to England was given the title of the 'Duke of Wellington.' His military career was over. He had won laurels in the field perhaps greater than any other general which England claimed to produce.

He was elected a member of the Parliament and then began his political career. He belonged to the Tory party and was thus a great enemy of reforms. The delay in the reforms in the Parliament from 1820 to 1830 was perhaps due to his successful opposition. The year 1828 saw him as the Prime Minister of England and he enjoyed this high prestige only for a short period of two years *i.e.* 1828 to 1830. It is an irony of fate that it was within the period of Wellington's Government that many reforms were introduced and passed. By the

Catholic Emancipation Act the Catholic people were allowed to sit in the Parliament and by the removal of Test Act all the disabilities of the Roman Catholic people were removed.

It was further during this period that many improvements in the internal affairs of England were brought about under the able guidance of Sir Robert Peel. The Duke of Wellington fought tooth and nail against the Reform Act of 1832 but he had to acknowledge his defeat, when the whole nation rose against him. He had, however, great confidence in Peel and whatsoever was recommended to him by the latter, he mostly agreed to that. He remained a member of Parliament (House of Lords) upto the last years of his life. He died in 1852 at the age of 83. He was, indeed, one of those great men of English History who saved their country at very critical times. He was a successful general but as a politician he proved himself a hopeless failure.

Sir Robert Peel

Sir Robert Peel, son of a millionaire as he was, got his early education and training like an aristocratic child. His father and other relatives had earned great fortune from the large scale production and factory system; thus they were in favour of Corn laws and they opposed the factory Act and the other reform measures in the Parliament. Peel had got his early training as an Under Secretary for the Irish and Home Affairs. He was a staunch Tory but he had one great quality that he was always open to conviction and whatsoever was justified he supported that at all costs.

During the period, when he was the Secretary for Internal Affairs, he improved the police system and if to-day the police of London, well-known by the name of

'Metropolitan Police', is considered the best unit, credit for that should go to Peel. Although an upholder of Conservatism yet he agreed to the Catholic Emancipation Act and the removal of the Test Act when he was convinced that both the Laws were justified and but for their introduction and passing the country might face a civil war. .

In 1839 he got a chance of becoming the Prime Minister of England, but he did not avail himself of that chance over a dispute with the Queen, on the Bed-Chamber question. If Sir Robert Peel, according to some writers, did not avail this chance it was due to a very narrow majority which he had over his opponents. In 1841, he became a Prime Minister again and this time he held office for a period of about five years. He was well-known for his insight in all the departments of the state and he personally supervised the work of every department. After his accession to power he removed many restrictions on trade, being a believer in the Free Trade Policy.

It was further during his days that a policy of Income Tax was started and the deficit which the Government had to bear from the removal of duties on several articles was met from this single tax. As regards the corn laws a policy of sliding scales was followed. Sir Robert Peel was always anxious to see that the price of the corn in every part of the country was the same. Peel as regards to concessions for the common people was always silent. The principles of his party being that of Conservatism he could not do any thing for the common people.

He, however, had to change his outlook when there was a famine in Ireland. It was as a result of the failure of potato crops. The only way to save the people of Ireland from starvation was the removal of corn duties. Peel introduced a Bill in the Parliament

but he was strongly opposed by his followers as it was completely against those principles, accepting which they had been in the Parliament. There was a split in the Conservative ranks. The people who followed Peel were called as "Peelites." Peel was supported by the Whigs and in spite of the fact that he was opposed by his own followers, he scaled down the opposition and got the Bill passed in the Parliament. Disraeli condemned him in strong terms and not only gave him the title of a deserter but also that of betrayer who deceived his party at a critical time.

There were people who criticised him but there were also people who appreciated him. After the Bill the Tory Party was divided into two parts and Peel being no more in majority, had no other alternative left but to resign. In 1850 he died and thus there ended another chapter of the Tory Party. He was indeed a great man of his times.

Palmerston

Palmerston, "a conservative at home and a revolutionary abroad" was one of the top ranking personalities of the Victorian Age. Born in 1784 he was brought up in the lap of luxury. He was educated at Harrow and Cambridge. At the young age of 22 he stepped in the political-fields of England when in 1806 he became a member of the English Parliament.

He was interested in war and in Foreign Affairs. He remained Secretary of War from 1809 to 1822 and a Foreign Minister from 1830 to 1865 with some brief intervals. He sympathised with the Greeks when they raised their standard of revolt against the despotic rule of Turkey. He was in favour of reforms upto the year 1832. But when the 1st Reform Act was passed he

changed his opinion as regards the reforms and remained a reactionary upto the end of his life. Like Duke of Wellington, who was a great obstacle in the way of 1st Reform Act of 1832, he opposed any further reform and so long his magnetic personality was in this world no Reform Bill for the reform of English Parliament could be introduced in the House of Commons. He was one of the most influential persons in the English Parliament from the year 1830 to 1865. He became the Foreign Secretary in the year 1830 and except with a brief interval of 5 years from 1841-46 he was controlling the foreign affairs of England upto the year 1865 when he died.

No doubt he was a reactionary and he opposed reforms in his own country but he was revolutionary in his foreign policy. He sympathised with all those revolutionary movements which took place on the Continent during this period. In this respect he was a disciple of Canning. He even went a step further. Canning only sympathised with the revolutionary movements but Palmerston also took an active part in these movements taking side of the revolutionaries.

After the death of the kings of Portugal and Spain there began a struggle for the thrones of both the countries. The contest in both the countries lay between uncles and nice. By chance in both the countries the princesses were being supported by the majority of their people being the believers of democratic ideas. The girls being enlightened Queens also had the sympathy of their people in this respect. The two uncles who just like their elder brothers believed in the despotic or divine powers of the kings tried to usurp the throne and thus stood against their nice. Thus the war was not between the uncles and the nice but between the two great parties having conflicting ideas. Palmerston, a first class revolutionary, helped the democratic side and it was owing to his active

participation in this struggle that it came to an end in favour of the democratic people.

There was, again, a movement in Italy for its unification after its liberation from the foreign yoke of Pope, the French and the Austrian people, Palmerston openly spoke and even helped Mazzini and Garibaldi the leaders of the revolutionary party and took rest only when the whole of Italy was united under a King who was a national King and had special care of his people in his mind.

There was a revolution in Austria and France against the despotic forces of both the states. The Magyars of Austria had been facing many hardships under the tyrannical and strong rule of Metternich, the Chancellor of Austria. They many a time tried for their freedom but were unsuccessful. When there was a terrible revolution raging in the different states of Europe they again, like the French, rose against their master.

In the beginning the chances were in favour of the revolutionary forces when the great despots of Europe like Metternich were fleeing for their lives. Palmerston openly spoke for the revolutionary forces. But unfortunately in the long run the despotic forces came out victorious in the whole of Europe and they mercilessly destroyed the democratic elements. The relations of England were estranged with these states at this time because all the European States had turned against England owing to her support to the revolutionary elements, when the existence of the European monarchs was in danger.

During the thirties of the 19th century Greek revolted against the Sultan of Turkey and so did Mehmet Ali the Sultan's viceroy of Egypt who after defeating the armies of his master over-ran Syria and Asia Minor. At this stage Turkey was saved from disintegration by the intercession of Russia. Mehmet again rebelled against his master

and threatened to declare war against Germany but he found Bismarck firm in his attitude and so gave way. Germany now attacked Denmark to capture the two territories of Holstein and Schleswig which though inhabited by the German speaking people were being ruled by the Duke of Denmark. Here also Palmerston took up the side of Denmark but his policy failed because he could not intimidate Bismarck though he had been able to intimidate the French Monarch on the Question of Belgium. Palmerston saved the people of Belgium from the clutches of France but he could not save the independence of the Poles from the hands of Germany.

The stars of Palmerston were declining and he had also to some extent become unpopular owing to his opposition to the Reform Act. In the year 1865 when the Germans were victoriously marching against Denmark he died. His case can be compared with Younger Pitt who died when he came to know about the defeat of his Allies at Austerlitz.

Thus in the end we can say that 'Old Palm', his nickname as kept by the English people owing to their devotion towards him, was one of the greatest personality of Europe in the nineteenth century. He had surpassed his teacher Canning in his foreign policy as he had successfully and actively interfered in the political and internal struggles of European countries and mostly he had come out with flying colour. It was only in the later years of his life that he had to acknowledge his diplomatic defeat from the hands of Bismarck. In fact he was only handled by Bismarck who was superior to him in diplomacy.

Benjamin Disraeli

Disraeli, an imperialist to the core, was one of the greatest personalities of the Victorian age. Born and

2. The accession of Canning to the foreign office was event of real significance alike for England and for Europe.' Discuss. (B. A. 1953)

3. Give an account of the part played by Duke of Wellington in the defeat of Napoleon.

4. Give a brief account of the career of Sir Robert

5. "Lord Palmerston has been described as a Conservative at home and a Revolutionist abroad." Explain. (M.A 1926)

6. Elucidate the statement that "the death of Palmerston may be said to have closed the transition period through which England passed in its progress from aristocracy to democracy." (B. A. Hons. 1912)

7. "Not that Lord Palmerston was a typical Whig.....Still less he was a typical Tory.....Politically indeed, it was not easy to label him,.....It is as a Foreign Minister not as a domestic reformer, that he will be remembered. (Marriot) Discuss. (B.A. 1938)

8. Give an account of the career of Disraeli and discuss the main principles of his policy. (B.A. 1941, 1944)

9. "He alienated Russia, failed to maintain the integrity of Turkey and to settle the question of the relation of Great Britain to Egypt." (Edwards) Is this a correct estimate of the foreign policy of Benjamin Disraeli. (B.A. 1944)

10. "Disraeli lived to be an idol and died to become tradition." Justify the remark as illustrated by his career. (B.A. Hons. 1913)

11. "Disraeli was the first minister since Canning, perhaps since Chatham, to think imperially." Elaborate the statement.

12. Sketch briefly the foreign policy and the administrative measures of the first ministry of Gladstone.

13. Give an account of the second Gladstone administration with special reference to Irish Affairs and Egypt.
(B.A. 1915)

14. What claim has Gladstone to the gratitude of Englishman?
(B.A. 1953)

15. For twenty-two years the interest of English politics centres round the dramatically contrasted figures of Gladstone and Disraeli. Indicate the main points of contrast between the character and statesmanship of the two above named personages.
(B.A. 1912)

CHAPTER XVIII

INDIA UNDER THE CROWN.

1858 to 1947.

The British East India Company by slow stages gained ascendancy in the Indian regions to such an extent that it became the paramount power. All the Indian States, one after another, had been defeated and compelled to acknowledge the supremacy of the Company. The Company became a sovereign power but its character and policy towards the Indians remained unchanged. It continued to exploit the Indians. It collected from the Indians crores of rupees in the form of revenue and other duties but it did not spend any amount on their uplift. If at all it spent some amount, it was negligible as compared with its revenues.

For most of the time the British Company was busy either making more and more gains from the Indian regions or extending its boundaries in all the directions. During the days of Lord Cornwallis, William Bentinck and Lord Dalhousie, there had been some reforms but the Indians unfortunately misunderstood them and thus instead of appreciation there was further estrangement between the Company and the people. At this critical stage, the missionaries of Christianity by openly criticising Hinduism and Islam further widened the gulf of hatred. The Indians politically enslaved, economically exploited, socially degraded and in their religion persecuted, needed a spark to set on fire that great ammunition of hatred which had

been gathering in their hearts for the last several decades. The Doctrine of Lapse served as material for the spark. The Volcano of the Indians' self-assertion erupted and there was a revolution in the history of India, the flames of which burst at Delhi, Kanpur, Lucknow, and Jhansi thus adding numerous other names to the already long list of so many who became martyrs for the cause of Indian independence.

The Revolution of 1857, painted by some British writers in the readers' eyes as a mutiny, although failed to achieve its object, yet it had far reaching results. It opened the eyes of the British Government which now realised the necessity of immediate relief to the Indian wounded sentiments.

With the year 1858 there began an era of reconciliation. The sky was clear and the British Government could now make or unmake her fortune in the Indian regions. Queen Victoria issued her famous **declaration of 1858**. After many heated debates in the House of Commons it was concluded that the Company had utterly failed to satisfy the Indian sentiments and was thus quite incompetent to give a rule to the regions. A closer study would, however, reveal that the British Company could not be wholly blamed for the catastrophe. The British Government was equally responsible as it was equally participating in the administration of India since the establishment of the Board of Control. But who was going to bother so much? The British Company was deprived of all its privileges and India came under the direct control of the British Government. The Board of Control was abolished and a Secretary with 15 Councillors was appointed by the British Government to look after the affairs of India. The Governor General in future was to be known as the Viceroy. Lord Canning, the last Governor General, was appointed the first Viceroy.

As the British Government had learnt a very bitter

lesson from policy of exploitation and persecution there were brought within the declaration some conciliatory measures. The Queen declared that the policy of Her Majesty was in no way to deprive any person of his justified rights. The Indian States were assured that the clauses of the Doctrine of Lapse would be no more brought in use and all the subordinate rulers were henceforth allowed to adopt their successors in case of no natural heir. The Indians were also assured that they would be appointed to responsible jobs of the Government without any distinction of caste and creed. Constructive work was started during the days of Lord Dalhousie. The Indians, however, did not co-operate. They would not travel in the railways constructed for them. Their superstitious nature can be well judged from the fact that during the struggle of 1857 they bombarded the railway engines at Allahabad from a safe distance. They called them western demons rather than use them for the transportation of their army. Under such circumstances a poor response was all but natural. The upheaval of 1857 further obstructed the constructive work.

It, however, was again started during the days of Lord Canning and it developed at a very rapid speed. The Indians also realised its importance and began to appreciate its utility. It brought a revolution in the Communication system of India. A net-work of railway spread over the whole of the country in a very short time. As the whole of the machinery had to be imported from England, it proved to be a costly scheme and it was seldom that the railways showed a profit during the British rule. Their utility, however, can never be over-estimated. In a country like India famines were frequent and it was railways alone that could ameliorate the sufferings of the millions by transporting wheat, rice and food-stuff from one place to another. It was also due to the railways that the distances of the vast country were conquered. This developed amongst the Indians a spirit

of unity when social intercourse became so easy with the development of rapid means of transport.

Agricultural Reforms

India is mainly an agricultural country. Although many new industries are being developed at present in different parts of the country yet a great majority of our population still depends on agriculture. Prosperity of a greater part of the country depends on the summer monsoons. Their failure combined with the age old agricultural system has many a time led to famines within the country.

Famines visited India many a time during the days of the British Company and took away millions of starving souls. The construction of railways brought relief. The famines of Orissa and Madras which took place in 1866 and 1877 respectively resulted in heavy mortality. The number of deaths went up to two millions and five millions respectively. During the famine in Orissa, crops in the other parts of the country grew in plenty but the tragedy was because of the lack of communication system in the far flung areas. There were famines in other parts of the country as well but they were not so severe in their intensity.

Another great famine took place during the days of Lord Curzon. It also resulted in the death of millions. Lord Curzon was thus compelled to bring about reforms in the agriculture system of the country. In order to improve the lot of the cultivators he declared that the lands of the cultivators could not be transferred to the money-lenders by sale or mortgage. Co-operative banks and societies were started to help the cultivators and to advance them loans at very reasonable rates. They could pay back the loans in easy instalments. He also established a special Agricultural Department to study the conditions of the cultivators and to devise some improved types of implements for the cultivators.

In 1878 the Government had already sanctioned an amount of 1½ crores to be kept aside from the treasury every year to meet any emergency arising in any part of the country. It was now further decided that from the rivers the canals should be brought out and more areas should be brought under cultivation. The new policy led to the increase of output to a great extent. The province of Panjab began to show a surplus of food every year. In the southern regions where the rivers flow only for about half a year tanks were dug out. In those tanks water of the rain was stored and provided through long tunnels to the affected areas. In northern India, wells were dug out to provide water to the crops. In the case of the failure of rain, there is no doubt a great loss but the intensity of famines has been reduced to a great extent by these reforms.

Reforms in the Health Departments

Reforms in the Health Departments of the States were also brought about. Indians being ignorant of the medical treatment on Western methods considered some of the diseases as God-sent calamities and instead of meeting them boldly surrendered to them. The result used to be a heavy toll of life. In the beginning the reforms met with an opposition from the Indians. Florence Nightingale who had won fame in the hospital at Scutari personally visited India and took up in hand cleansing of the cities. In spite of her drive for keeping the cities clean she achieved a partial success. The sanitary conditions remained appalling upto the beginning of the second quarter of the twentieth century. Plague visited India during the period of Lord Curzon. Millions lost their lives because of ignorance in the matter. It was after a great struggle that the epidemic was brought under control.

Reforms in Educational System

Although by the end of the 18th century the British East India Company had become a respectable ruling power in India yet it never thought of the social and educational advancement of the people under its control. When the British Government renewed the charter of the British Company in 1813 the former asked the latter to spend an amount of £10,000 a year from the Indian revenues for the spread of education amongst the Indians. It is sad to note that even the medium of instruction through which education should be imparted to the Indians could not be decided upto 1833. After a great controversy between Macaulay and Wilson it was finally agreed upon that English should be the medium of instruction. If English was declared as the medium of instruction it was because of the high salaries which had to be given to the Europeans even for subordinate posts. By introducing English as the medium of instruction there was no more the necessity of importing English knowing persons for subordinate services from abroad. From amongst the Hindus now were to be taken the "Babus" and from amongst the Muslims the 'Khansamas'. During the days of Lord Hardinge the Indians were told that the knowledge of English was compulsory for all Government appointments. According to the recommendation of Wood's despatch, three universities at Calcutta, Madras and Bombay were established. It was further decided that every province should have at least one college and in every district there should be at least one school. Department of Public Instruction was opened in every province.

The upheaval of 1857, however, checked the progress of education and it was from 1860 onwards that the recommendation which had been approved began to be implemented. Schools and colleges were opened although the policy of the Government continued to remain as the creation of Babus and Khansamas.

Lord Ripon who has been greatly admired by the Indians and who had in the true sense his sympathies with the Indians further gave an encouragement to the educational system as per recommendations of Hunters Commission. The Panjab University started functioning in 1882. Vernacular languages were encouraged as well. The administration of schools and colleges was entrusted to the Municipalities and the District Boards respectively.

Further changes in the educational system were brought about during the period of Lord Curzon. By the University Act of 1904 the educational system was organised on the Western pattern. The system, however, could not gain the co-operation of the people because to the conference which met at Simla for the remodelling of the educational system there were invited the representatives of the official class only. The recommendations could not be popular because the official views were not acceptable to the people.

The days of Lord Harding saw further encouragement of the educational system. An amount of half a crore was set apart for the education of the Indians. Further recommendations for the improvement of the educational system were made by the Sadler's Commission in 1917. According to the Government of India Act of 1919, education became a transferred subject.

There are many defects in the present educational system. Although a part of the woman community has become progressive yet purda system among women is a great hindrance in the way of their higher education. The system of imparting education itself is defective.

National Movement

An armed revolt of the Indians failed but it had far reaching results. The British Government since its

accession to power had been bringing in such measures as might reconcile the Indians. The construction of railways, medical and sanitary reforms, famine relief measures and the development of education amongst the Indians were steps to pacify the Indians who were burning with the fire of revenge.

Indians learnt at least one lesson from the upheaval. They realised that it was not possible for them to liberate their country from the foreign yoke by force. Thus the history of India from the accession of Crown to power upto the independence of India is nothing but a long record of a peaceful struggle of the Indians for their independence and the British policy of offering more and more concession, with some repressive measures also at a time, to pacify the Indian struggle.

After the upheaval of 1857 there was a general opposition of the people to the type of rule prevailing within the State. The laws of the time of the British East India Company, originally made for the people of Bengal were still in vogue. These were now for all the Indians. Although the Crown had taken over the administration of India and had assured every reasonable concession to India yet in reality there had been no change in the policy of the Government towards the people. There was, however, a change of attitude towards the Indian states. The policy of the British East India Company towards the Indian states was that of 'subordinate isolation'. The Crown, however, appreciated their services in the upheaval of 1857 and its policy was that of subordinate co-operation towards them. They were taken into confidence and consulted in all the matters of the State.

In 1861 the British Government passed the Indian Council Act by which it established an all Indian Council for the framing of laws for the Indians. It was a council of non-official members taken from all over India. An other

important clause of the Council Act was the addition of another member to the executive council of the Viceroy. It was also decided that the presidencies of Bombay and Madras were to have their provincial legislative councils.

This was the first step of the British Government towards decentralization. After this date the British Government offered more and more concessions to the Indians.

There was the rise of a class of intellectuals amongst the Indians in the meantime. These people read English not to become 'Babus' or 'Khansamas' but they read it to understand the real sentiments of the English. A deep study of the English literature revealed to them that the English were very freedom loving people and had a great love for their country. These intellectuals wanted to bring a similar type of spirit of independence amongst their own countrymen.

There was then the rise of another class, called the reformers. Raja Ram Mohan Roy had already paved the way for reforms by a revolt against the rigid Hindu laws during the 1st half of the nineteenth century. He even supported Lord William Bentinck when the latter brought in measures to abolish the defective customs like that of sati, infanticide and human sacrifice of the Hindu society. The followers of Raja Ram Mohan's new sect which he started were called Brahmo Samajists.

During the second half of the nineteenth century Swami Daya Nand and Vivekanand raised their voice against the defective society. Their assertion was not restricted to a revolt against the defective religion but they went a step further. They propagated amongst the people the ideas of liberty. The Hindu society which was rotten to its very core got a new life by these reforms and there was now a spirit of assertion and enlightenment in its fold. These enlightened leaders advised the Indians not to look to the West for guidance but to gain real

knowledge while going through their ancient records. They declared that, "It was not the East which was to look towards the West but it was now the West which was to look to the East."

It was at this stage when a spirit of assertion and equality was taking roots in the minds of the Indians that there was witnessed a change in the policy of the British Government towards the Indians. The period of reconciliation ended and a period of strong policy ensued. The Indians found within the policy a direct challenge to their rights and were thus estranged. Lord Lytton remained strict towards the Indians during the period of his Viceroyalty. His successor, however, realised the critical situation and never brought in a measure which might injure the feelings of the Indians. He encouraged the Indians in every walk of life but unfortunately the whole of the European element with the exception of a few was in opposition to him.

During the period of his viceroyalty Lord Ripon restored the state of Mysore to a heir of the Old Hindu Raja from whom the state had been taken away by William Bentinck for mal-administration. He brought about reforms in the educational system. To the vernacular press he gave the very rights which were enjoyed by the English newspapers. He won over the love and admiration of the Indians. He tried to bring them at par with the Europeans but he could not be successful because of the opposition of Europeans. By Ilbert Bill there was made an attempt during his Viceroyalty to give the Indian Judges the right of deciding the cases of European criminals. It met with a storm of opposition. It could only be brought into practice after many amendments. During the agitation the Europeans used objectionable words "for" the Indians. That led to the estrangement of relations between the two groups.

The controversy over the Ilbert Bill gave a stimulus to the already smouldering fire and counter agitations began within the country. The Indian National Congress was established at this critical stage in 1885 by some Indian intellectuals. They had the support of the Government. The Government wanted to use its members as tools for knowing the grievances of the Indians. Its policy was to pacify the Indian movement by some piecemeal concessions. It, however, could not be successful. The Indian National Congress asked the Government to free the country and to give to its people 'Home Rule'. When the designs of the Indian National Congress were made known to the Government it prevented its officials from attending the meeting of the Congress. A group of Muslims under Sir Sayyad Ahmad Khan boycotted the movement and started a counter movement.

The agitation of the Indian National Congress combined with the agitation of the Indians over the Ilbert Bill led to the passing of the Act of 1892. There was further addition to the members of the Imperial Legislative Council and the provincial legislative councils. The members of the Council got the right of discussing the budget.

Plague and famines in the days of Lord Elgin II and Lord Curzon, combined with their imperialistic policy spoiled the chance of a reconciliation between the ruling class and the ruled. The Indian National Congress had already boycotted the Act of 1892. It made capital out of the famines and plague and widened the gulf between the people and the Government. The over-centralization policy of Lord Curzon met with a storm of opposition. Even some of his beneficial measures were misunderstood. The partition of Bengal, the University Act of 1904 and Raleigh's Commission made him very unpopular. His controversy with Kitchner led to his recall and truly some writer has described his position when he writes, "His departure was as much welcomed as had been welcomed his arrival".

The situation had gone beyond control. Lord Minto II during his five years' period of Viceroyalty tried to pacify the Indian political leaders but he was not successful. The Indian Council Act of 1909, with all its drawbacks could not satisfy the Indian masses. It is true that there was a split within the Congress over the Act of 1909 and the moderates welcomed the new move but it was for a very short period. Even the moderates boycotted it as they found in the Indian Council Act of 1909 the seeds of separate electorate and also that of the future policy of 'Divide and Rule'.

The British Government was very anxious to satisfy the masses one way or the other. George V visited India and in a grand Darbar at Delhi, which he declared as the Capital of India, rescinded the partition of Bengal. The Great War in the meantime began. The British Government appealed to the Indian political leaders and masses to liberally help the Government at that critical juncture. It even promised liberal concessions after the end of the War. The War came to an end in 1919. The services of Indians had been appreciated by the Secretary of State for India in 1917 in his speech in the House of Commons. The Indians naturally expected a lot after the war ended with the victory of the Britishers. The Indian Council Act of 1919 was passed by the British Parliament. When the clauses of the Act were made known to the Indians they were horrified. They hoped for self-government but they got nothing. The Rowlatt Act further widened the gulf. There were agitations over the whole of the country. Then there was the Jallianwala Bagh tragedy. The Indians under the leadership of Mr. B. G. Tilak and Mahatma Gandhi started a non-violent, non-co-operation movement. The Muslims also joined the movement as they were also very much estranged with the British Government over the humiliation of the Caliph.

Although the Indians boycotted the Indian Council

Act of 1919 yet it was not without concessions. It was a great step towards decentralization and dyarchy was established within the provinces.

The Indians carried on their struggle for independence during the coming years under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi, Lala Lajpat Rai etc. Many meetings were arranged between the Viceroy and the revolutionary leaders, but no final settlement could be arrived at. During the Viceroyalty of Lord Irwin Round Table Conferences were held for a final settlement but these remained unsuccessful as the Indians wanted nothing short of full-fledged liberty. Although the Government of India Act of 1935 led to further decentralization yet it could not pacify the Indian sentiments. The agitation went on till there came another world wide crisis i. e., the Second World War. These were very critical years in the history of the British Government. Within the Congress ranks there was the revolt of Subhash Chander Bose who founded Forward Block which believed in the policy of the use of force and an open revolt against the British Government if there arose such necessity for the freedom of India. The 'Quit India' movement was launched in 1942. The Muslim League party in the meantime had come into prominence under the leadership of Mohammad Ali Jinnah.

The Japanese were rapidly advancing upon India and had already subdued the greater part of the South Eastern Asia. Germany had compelled France to surrender and the German forces now were fighting against Russia in the streets of Leningrad. The 'Quit India' movement was indeed very dangerous for the cause of the British Government. The Government imprisoned all the revolutionary leaders to suppress an internal rising in India.

In 1945 the Second World War came to an end. The revolutionary leaders were set at liberty. But another great danger which was now lurking on the borders

of India was that of Russia. The British Government not finding itself strong enough, thought of freeing India. The leaders of different parties were called in a Conference. They were assured that they would be given independence provided they could come to some settlement amongst themselves. On the 15th of August, 1947 India achieved independence after a struggle of about half a century. She was divided into two parts—India and Pakistan.

Thus the rule of the British Government in India came to an end.

Foreign Policy

India, being under British domination, had no independent foreign policy of her own. Her foreign policy was to be determined by the relations of the British Government with the other powers of the world. Afghanistan, Tibet and Burma were her immediate neighbours. None of these powers was strong enough to be an aggressor towards India. India, however, had many complications in her foreign policy. These were created by the British Government. During the period of the British Company's rule the menace of the Afghans, the French and the Russians remained always hanging on the minds of the British Governor Generals in India. The missions of Lord Minto to Persia, Afghanistan and the Panjab were to counteract the designs of Napoleon in the East. The 1st Afghan War was fought to see a British puppet on the throne of Afghanistan. The struggle with the Gorkhas was simply to control their foreign policy and thus to safeguard the Northern borders of India from the lurking danger of Russia which might find its outlet through Nepal.

The chief aim of the foreign policy, under the Crown, was to check the growing influence of Russia on the North Western borders of India and to counteract the

designs of the French in upper Burma. The 1st Afghan War proved beyond doubt that the Afghans would not tolerate any foreign domination. The Afghan state, being a buffer state, however, always looked with anxiety at the relations between the Russians and the English as these were also to affect her country. The Crimean war, in which England and Russia were rival powers, bewildered Dost Mohammad, the Afghan ruler. He assured the Britishers that he was their friend and wanted to remain their friend even in the near future. He, however, requested them that they should not interfere in the internal affairs of Afghanistan. Lord Lawrence, the British Viceroy in India, acted accordingly. His policy was to be loyal to the Afghan throne and not to a particular family. He wanted to fortify the borders of India. This policy of his has been characterized as a policy of 'Masterly inactivity.'

The policy of Lord Lawrence was followed by his two immediate successors, Lord Mayo and Lord Northbrook. Sher Ali, who succeeded Dost Mohammad to the throne of Afghanistan after a protracted struggle for succession, was acknowledged by the British Government as the ruler of Afghanistan. He visited India during the days of Lord Mayo. In the conference of Ambala he requested the Viceroy that the Britishers should give him definite assurance of help against his internal and external enemies. He under the circumstances was ready to go by the instructions of the British Government in his foreign policy. Lord Mayo hesitated to make some commitments and thus the meeting ended without any results.

The growing danger of the Russian aggression on the border of Afghanistan compelled Sher Ali to approach the British Government in India again for some definite commitments. He, however, found the British Government quite indifferent in the matter. Lord Northbrook frankly wrote to him that the British Government could

not share his alarm which it considered baseless. It would, however, help the Afghan ruler with money and material when it deemed fit. This loose type of assurance could not satisfy the Afghan ruler. In the meantime there arose a dispute between Afghanistan and Persia over the question of Seistan. The British officials were to finally fix up the boundaries of the two states. Seistan was divided into two parts. One went to Persia and the other to Afghanistan. The territories which fell to the share of Afghanistan were comparatively less fertile and barren. This further estranged the relations of the Afghans with the British Government. The Afghans now drifted towards Russia.

Imperialistic Disraeli succeeded the peaceful Gladstone. With his accession to power there was felt a great change in the foreign policy of England. The policy of British Government of India also underwent a change. Lord Lytton succeeded Lord Northbrook to the office of the Viceroy. He wrote to Sher Ali that the latter should allow the Britishers to open their intelligence agencies in his state. He should keep a resident at his court and surrender his foreign policy to the Britishers. The British Government in their turn would agree to all his demands which he had put forward in the conference at Ambala. Sher Ali was helpless as he had already agreed to similar concessions to be given by the Russians.

Abdulla Jan, the favourite son of Sher Ali died in the meanwhile. Lord Lytton wanted reception for his messenger which Sher Ali could not give because of the state mourning for the departed soul. His refusal led to a war. The British forces defeated the Afghans and occupied Kabul. Sher Ali escaped to Russian Turkistan and shortly afterwards died. Yaqub Khan, a son of Sher Ali who was holding Western parts of Afghanistan came to terms with the British Government and by the Treaty of Gandamak he surrendered his foreign affairs

to the Britishers and agreed to keep a resident at his Court.

Lord Lytton thought it a permanent peace but the events proved otherwise. The history of the 1st Afghan War was repeated although the British loss of life in this struggle was comparatively very small. Cawagnari, the British resident was murdered a few days after the withdrawal of British forces from Kabul. The whole of Afghanistan was in an open revolt. General Roberts advanced upon Kabul and crushed down the rebellious elements. Yaqub Khan was dethroned. He, however, could not come to any conclusion as regards the disposal of the conquered territories. The Afghans, under Ayub Khan, won a decisive victory at Mairawal. The Afghans were again defeated but their resistance now was becoming a national resistance.

At this critical time there was a change of Ministry at home. Lord Ripon succeeded Lord Lytton to the Viceroyalty of India. Abdur Rahman, a grandson of Dost Mohammed who had been living with the Russians since the struggle for succession to Dost Mohammad appeared on the scene. He was brought to the throne of Kabul and he agreed to be a friend of the friends of Britishers and an enemy of their enemies. The Britishers gained some territories in the North Western India and thus the British boundaries now touched their natural points.

The relations between the Afghans and the Britishers remained friendly. The Afghans, however, felt the tutelage of the Britishers and were very anxious to free themselves. The anarchy which prevailed in the Panjab and the other parts of Northern India as a result of the Jallianwala Bagh tragedy gave Aman Ullah, the ruler of Afghanistan, a chance to strike at the Britishers and to assert his independence. The war did not prove to be a prolonged affair and it came to an end by the Treaty

of Rawalpindi. The Amir was acknowledged an independent ruler of Afghanistan. The subsidies were stopped. Since that date the relations between the Britishers and the Afghans remained cordial.

As regards the relations with the Burmese it was during the period of Lord Alcock that the Burmese were defeated and deprived of all their possessions lying out of Burma. Lord Dalhousie defeated the Burmese in the second Burmese war and annexed the lower parts of Burma. King Thibaw, the ruler of Burma now controlled only the Northern parts of Burma. During the last quarter of the nineteenth century the French and the English, the two rival nations had fixed up their eyes on the upper Burma. Both of them wanted to capture it. The Britishers won the game when during the Viceroyalty of Lord Dufferin they attacked upper Burma at the complaint of Bombay-Burma Trading Corporation—an Indian company trading in Burma. King Thibaw was defeated and upper Burma was annexed in the British Empire.

Tibet is known to the people of India since time immemorial. The Buddhist missionaries converted its people to Buddhism. The relations, however, could not be developed because of the high snow laden peaks of Himalayas which obstructed the path. Warren Hastings was the first English man in India who thought of a trade with Tibet. Two missions were despatched but these met with no success as the people of Tibet did not like the presence of foreigners in their country.

When the state of Sikkim acknowledged the supremacy of the Britishers their interest in Tibet again developed but upto the year 1885 no commercial mission could be despatched. Even the mission despatched came to nothing.

The Tibetans again came into contact with the Britishers when there arose a quarrel between the Tibetans

and the people of Sikkim under the protectorate of the Britishers over the undefined territories lying between the two states. The British Government despatched its forces and defeated the Tibetans. A boundary line was drawn between the two states by a joint commission of the rival parties.

During the days of Lord Curzon the question of Tibet again came up. Russia was increasing her influence within the state and it was an eyesore for the Britishers. The British Government of India despatched a mission and at the refusal of Tibetan authority to admit it declared a war. The Tibetans were defeated. The war came to an end by the Treaty of Lhasa. The Tibetans paid war indemnity and allowed the Britishers to open their Trading agencies within the country.

Questions

1. Discuss the main landmarks in the history of the struggle for political freedom. (B. A. 1953)
2. Give an account of the constitutional development under the Crown.
3. Discuss British Indian educational policy from 1833 onward with particular reference to its bearing on (a) nationalism (b) social reform and (c) economic development. (B.A. 1952)
4. Describe briefly the foreign policy of India under the Crown.

CHAPTER XIX

"IRISH QUESTION DURING THE NINETEENTH CENTURY"

The union act of 1800 united the parliaments of England and Ireland, but it could not unite the hearts of the two countries. The British Prime Minister had promised the Irish people a Catholic Emancipation Act. By this act the Roman Catholics of Ireland, who formed a bulk of the population were to be given the right of sitting in the Parliament. He, however, could not fulfil the promise owing to the opposition of George III, and resigned in disgust. The Irish problem thus remained unsolved.

Canning, who had supported Younger Pitt over the Catholic Emancipation Act, carried on his work after his death and in 1810 he introduced a Bill in the Parliament for securing a right of sitting for the Irish Roman Catholics. The Bill, however, could not become an Act due to the opposition of the Whigs.

With the death of George III the English politics was much improved. The time was now ripe for reforms and granting some concessions to the depressed humanity. The Irish people were allowed to send one hundred members to the House of Commons. The Roman Catholics were also permitted to vote for the Parliament. They elected O'Connell a great orator to the Parliament. Being a Roman Catholic he was not allowed to sit in the Parliament. This led to a great uproar in Ireland. A civil

war seemed to be imminent. Duke of Wellington, the Prime Minister of England, realized the critical situation. After getting the "Catholic Emancipation Bill" passed by the Parliament, he allowed O'Connell to attend its session. The Irish thus won the issue by adopting the attitude of a desperate nation. The British Parliament, however, was too clever for them. It raised the qualifications of a voter from a 40 shillings to £10 free-holder. This debarred the peasantry of Ireland from voting. The position of Irish Roman Catholics thus remained the same, viz., before the passing of the Catholic Emancipation Act. This led to a great discontentment among the people and their problem remained unsolved.

Disraeli, a great leader of Conservative party had once rightly remarked, "Ireland had a starving population, an absentee aristocracy and an alien Church." The people in Ireland after the passing of the "Catholic Emancipation Act" had now social, economic, religious and some political grievances. The Roman Catholics were in a majority in Ireland, the agitation was, therefore started against the religious disabilities first. The Irish Catholics resented payment to the Protestant Church in which they had no belief. The payment made by the people was called as "Tithes". A struggle against the payment was started which is well known in history as "A struggle against the Tithes". Riots broke out in different parts of the country. Many tithes collectors lost their lives. This condition of the Protestant Clergies, who were maintaining these religious places, deteriorated due to the non-payment of tithes. The British Government handled the situation very roughly and adopted very repressive measures. After sometime she, however, realised that it was not possible to suppress a movement which was based upon a justified cause. She was now to better the condition of the Irish people but in such a way as may not directly affect the churchman of Ireland. These churches were a burden on the Irish society. Although they were maintained by the amount realised in taxes by the Irish

peoples they always supported the cause of the British Parliament. The policy of the Govt. was to find a compromise between the two groups. She reduced the number of bishoprics and declared that the surplus amount collected for the religious places will be spent on the betterment of the Irish people. This reconciliatory measure was, however, opposed by the Tories and thus no amount could be spared for the Irish people. Their demand remained unsatisfied.

The Ministry of Melbourne was the next to deal with the problems of Ireland. It realised the hopeless condition of the Irish people and their political, economic, social and religious grievances. The Irish Roman Catholics had quite a respectable position in British Parliament. Melbourne was willing to redress their grievances. He had the support of the Irish Members of the Parliament and he was, therefore, secure in the office. He, first of all, took up their economic grievances. By the Irish Poor Land Act, he tried to satisfy the unemployed and disabled people of Ireland. Workhouses were opened in the different parts of the Ireland. Those who joined these workhouses were at least some of their two time meal. It did not give any concession to the people who remained outside these workhouses. The conditions of the cultivators remained the same. The absentee landlords carried on their tyranny on the depressed peasantry through their agents. The Irish people objected to the religious taxes. To soothen their feelings, they were told that in future a part of these taxes would be spent on their betterment and a part would go to the already established churches. The Tories would not agree to this concession. They found within their move a great challenge to the Protestant supremacy. It was, therefore, decided that the tax should now be collected as a land rent. In fact, the tax still fell upon the cultivators as the landlords increased the land revenue to the same extent. The idea to relieve the cultivators and to get some amount from the pockets of the absentee landlords was thus defeated.

The Irish Municipal Act brought a great improvement in the Municipalities of Ireland. There was a move for the qualification of a voter to the Municipal election. Melbourne had a mind to fix it at £5. But he had to give in before the opposition and had to raise it to £10. A close study of his reforms would reveal that all his measures were half hearted attempts to meet the grievances. They had indeed gained nothing. These grievances continued to remain the same as before. The Irish people were still to pay the religious taxes but under a different head. Another noteworthy point was the appointment of Drummond to Ireland. Although he had no powers to relieve the Irish people from their disabilities, he had a sympathetic attitude towards their problems. This went a long way to pacify the Irish movement and to keep them peace-loving for a time.

The accession to power of Peel led to the reopening of the Irish problem. Peel, the leader of the conservative party, who had always opposed concessions to the Roman Catholics of Ireland, was an eyesore to them. O'Connell, the leader of the Irish movement, predicted a period of repression and suppression. He asked the people of Ireland to revive their agitation for their independence and to break all connections with the Government which was exploiting them. Peel was not ignorant of this opposition. Taking precautionary measures, he passed "Armed Act." By this act the Irish people of disturbed regions could not keep any arms with them. They could not also hold meetings. O'Connell, had asked the Irish people for a meeting at Clontarf. He knew that the people in spite of the warning of the Government would assemble at the appointed hour. He later realised that the Government would not tolerate this meeting and there would be a great bloodshed. He wanted to avoid it. He, therefore, asked the people not to assemble. Unfortunately, Peel, however, did not appreciate this co-operative spirit of O'Connell. He was tried and imprisoned for a long time. O'Connell had already lost popularity by his cowardly attitude at Clontarf. He was not that

old bold man. Shattered in health and prestige, he came out of jail and withdrew himself for ever from active politics.

Although Peel was against the separation of Irish Parliament from the English one, yet he was ready to give every other reasonable concession to the Irish people. After the failure of O'Connell agitation, Peel appointed a commission headed by Devon. This commission was to go through the grievances of the Irish people and report to the Government. The commission realized the hopeless condition of the tenants. They had no fixity of tenure and could be evicted at any time by their landlords without any compensation. It put forth its recommendations for the betterment of the tenants. These recommendations, however, met a strong opposition and could not be passed. Nevertheless, Peel was in a position to improve the educational system in Ireland. To the already established Mayrooth College he gave an increased grant. He also established new colleges in the other parts of Ireland. The new colleges were of secular character. They were not liked by the followers of either of the two religions. Thus this great work of Peel passed without any appreciation.

Peel, being a member of the Tory party had a conservative attitude towards all reforms in the country. He was a protectionist. No relief could, therefore, be expected from him in the removal of the corn laws, but, he was, reasonable in his attitude towards all matters. Whenever he was convinced of something, he gave his full support to it. During his period there was a famine in Ireland. It was the result of the failure of the potato crop, which was the main crop in the country. It was feared that thousand of people would die by starvation. Peel immediately brought in the Parliament relief measures. He introduced a bill in the House of Commons for the removal of the corn laws. He was opposed by his own conservative party-men but he never cared for that. He was able to get the bill passed through the Parliament with the help of the opposition party.

Russell inherited from Peel the troubles of Ireland. Although Peel had tried to provide work to the Irish peasant and removed corn laws he could relieve them of their hopeless condition. They were in a very tight corner and hundreds of them died daily of starvation. The Ministry of Russell was thus compelled to bring in more improvements. The final relief was given during the Ministry of Gladstone.

After his accession to power, Gladstone declared in the House of Commons that his mission was to pacify Ireland. He brought in such measures by slow stages which might relieve the situation in Ireland and thus again bring a period of peace and prosperity.

He first of all attacked the very legality of the Irish church which had out-lived its utility, which was not attended by the majority of the population, which was maintained at the cost of the Irish people, completely against their wishes and which they considered as an unnecessary burden. Gladstone also thought in their terms and wanted to bring an end of the legal position of the Church. When there was a move from an Irish member for the reform of the Church, Gladstone immediately entertained the idea and laid stress on the separation of the Church from the Government. It is true that the Church imparted education but it was not in reality a privilege for the whole of the population. Catholics and the dissenters were never seen amongst the people being educated at these religious places. The Roman Catholics found within the Church, a great mark of their slavery so they hated it and renamed it as 'Alien Church'. The 'Fanién Brotherhood' movement gave an impetus to the already prevailing anarchy and disorder. The British Government was thus compelled to take up the Irish Church question in 1868. Even the elections were fought by Gladstone on the Irish issue. As he returned to the House of Commons with an overwhelming majority it was now crystal clear that even

the English people had realised the necessity of the removal of religious restrictions from over the Irish people. In 1869 it was decided by the House of Commons that the Irish Church should be separated from the Government, that all the religious courts should be abolished and that the representatives of the Church henceforward should not be allowed to sit in the House of Lords. As regards the property of the church which amounted to £16 million it was decided that a part of it should be given to the newly reorganised Irish Church private co-operation while the rest of the amount should be kept in reserve to meet the emergencies in Ireland. The Conservatives opposed it but Gladstone was in a position to scale down their opposition. He got it passed with a great majority.

The Bill was then sent to the House of Lords for their approval. They wanted to bring such type of amendments in the Bill which were not acceptable to Gladstone. There was a crisis in the Parliament. Queen Victoria interfered in the matter at this critical stage. By her intercession the Bill was passed by the House of Lords but after some amendments which had already been agreed upon by the leaders of both the Houses. This great step of Gladstone once for all removed the loom of the Protestant supremacy from the minds of the Catholics and they now no more considered themselves to be at the mercy of the Protestants.

Gladstone now turned his attention towards the economic grievances of the Irish people. There had been Absentee land-lordism, since the days of Oliver Cromwell. Most of the landlords resided in England. It was seldom that they visited Ireland, where they had their estates. They had their agents in Ireland for the administration of their estates. Ireland had a dense population but a very negligible industrial system. Most of the Irish people were agriculturists. Agriculture being the main occupation, a great competition followed for the tenancy of

lands. The agents of the lords fully exploited the situation and charged such a high rent as it was not possible for the cultivators to pay. The landlords thus got the lion's share and cultivators were leading a hand to mouth life. Secondly they had no security of tenure. They could be turned out by their landlords at any time without an excuse at a notice of six months. They could not claim compensation for the improvements which they had brought in their respective lands during the period of tenure. It was indeed a grave injustice. Tenants in Ulster, however, had the right to claim compensation.

Gladstone wanted to better the lot of the poor Irish cultivators so by the **Irish Land Act of 1870** he declared similar concessions to all the Irish tenants which were enjoyed by the tenants of Ulster. The Act on the part of Gladstone was considered to bring a revolution in the Irish history. By this Act it was notified that if a cultivator was turned out of the land, for any reason other than the non-payment of the rent, he must be compensated by the landlord, this, however, could not relieve the situation as the landlords immediately by the powers which they had still in their rights undid the effect of the Act. They increased the rent, which was within their rights to such an extent that it became impossible for the Irish tenants to pay that. As they left the lands for non-payment they could not claim any compensation for the improvement which they brought about in lands. The Irish grievances remained unredressed and thus Ireland could not be pacified.

The failure of Gladstone's Irish policy became clear when the Irish rose against their exploiters in the different parts of the country and brought a reign of terror in the country. Gladstone could not check their growing troubles and so took strong measures to curb down their risings, the people were prohibited from keeping arms and the police was given more power to check

lawlessness in the country. Hundreds of suspected persons were arrested and imprisoned. Some Irish-men organised a society called "Ribbon Society" which was akin to that of Fenian Brotherhood in its activities. Its nefarious activities led to anarchy and complete insecurity of life in the whole of Westmeath area. The Government of Gladstone, which was not going to submit to such sort of lawless element, passed the Westmeath Act. By this Act the Lord-Lieutenant was given the power of declaring all those areas disturbed where terrorism was at its height. He was also allowed to arrest suspected people without a warrant and to imprison them without trial. The strong measures had the required results. Many members of Ribbon Society sought their safety in an escape to the other parts of the globe. And thus peace was brought back in Ireland after a long period of turmoil.

Gladstone also tried to improve the Irish educational system. He based it on secular principles to cement friendly relations between the members of two divergent religions--Catholics and Protestants. He wanted to secure for Dublin University the position of Central University of Ireland to which all the Catholic and Protestant colleges might be affiliated. He was unsuccessful, as his bill was neither liked by the Irish people nor was it in a position to get a vote of majority in the Parliament. Gladstone resigned.

Although the Irish did not appreciate the services of the first ministry of Gladstone, yet he had tried his level best to win for the Irish people all sorts of concessions. He removed their religious disabilities. He brought in some agrarian reforms and he even tried to bring an end of religious differences of Catholics and Protestants--the two divergent religions, by his educational reforms. His mission to pacify Ireland, however, failed. Gladstone failed, but he failed splendidly as had failed at a time Aurangzeb in his ambitions after toiling hard for a long time.

During his second administration the policy of Gladstone towards the Irish people was that of "Kick and Kindness." When he realized the exploitation of the Irish landlords he became kind, and sympathetic towards the grievances of Irish tenants. But when he came to know about the lawlessness which prevailed as a result of the trouble-some element amongst the Irish people he became harsh in his attitude. As discussed before the Irish Land Act of 1871 could not remove the economic grievances of the Irish people. The people of Ireland still remained at the mercy of their landlords. The failure of the crops further aggravated their troubles. They in a desperate condition took to crimes and outrages to an extent never known before. Gladstone wanted to remove their grievances but he could not tolerate the disorder within the country.

Gladstone first tried to pacify their movement by further concessions to the Irish people. He introduced a bill in the House of Commons by which a tenant could claim compensation, if he was unable to pay the rent because of the failure of crop and was evicted from the land. The Bill was passed by the House of Commons but it was rejected by the Lords. The rejection of bill further estranged the Irish and under the leadership of Parnell they organised themselves to save themselves from the exploitation of their landlords. They decided that that land should not be taken by an Irish tenant from where an other Irish tenant had been evicted by the landlord even if it was offered at the lowest rate. The organisation further decided to boycott that tenant and not to allow him to sit among them who had got such type of land. This type of organisation was definitely to pull down the aristocratic structure in Ireland. The landlords, who had greater resources to take a stand, retaliated and preferred to leave their lands fallow rather than surrender before such organisations. The desperate tenants then took to crimes and other outrages. This led to the passing of the protection of Property Bill. Hundreds of suspected persons were sent

behind the bars. This could not, however, pacify the movement.

Gladstone again interfered and brought in more concessions for the Irish people. By the Land Act of 1881 the policy of '3 F's' was adopted. It was declared that in future there would be a fair rent, fixed by impartial Land Courts and a fixed period of tenancy. The tenant was also free to sell his improvements on terminating his lease, Gladstone even went a step further and encouraged the cultivators to ask for a loan from the Government, on easy instalment basis and thus to purchase the land from the landlords. The Bill in spite of the sincerity of the introducer could not satisfy the Irish people because of its too vague terms.

The dissatisfaction of the Irish people came forth in the form of an increase in crimes, disorder and anarchy. Gladstone could not tolerate it and now a policy of meeting the situation with a strong hand was adopted. Parnell, the leader of the Irish movement was arrested and sent behind the bars. Many other suspected persons were transported for life. The strong attitude of the Government instead of quelling the disturbance further increased it. Within the continuation of the arrest of Parnell the Government of Gladstone feared the possibility of an open revolt in Ireland and thus it became ready to release Parnell if the latter co-operated with the Government for the maintenance of law and order. When negotiations for a settlement were going on there occurred the murder of Lord Frederick Cavendish and Mr. Burke at Bhoenix Park. This brought an end of all possibilities of a settlement and compelled the Government not to be lenient in any case towards the Irish movement. The Irish movement lost all its chances of gaining concessions and the movement for a time died out when Parnell withdrew himself from the agitation and strongly condemned the foul murder.

The Irish question again opened with the accession of Gladstone to power for the third time. Gladstone during his

second ministry had followed both the repressive and lenient measures but had failed to pacify Ireland. He was now converted to **'Home Rule'** ideas. It was now a general belief of Gladstone that the only alternative to please the Irish people was to let them have a separate government. The ideas, however, were not liked by many of his supporters. They thus did not join him when he formed his Third Government. After his resumption of his charge of government Gladstone introduced the **'First Home Rule Bill'** in the Parliament. According to this bill Ireland was to have a separate Parliament consisting of two orders. The representatives of the people were to have the control over the executive posts of the state. Ireland was no more to send her representatives in the British Parliament.

The Bill was opposed by all the great guns of England. Some of them gave vent to their feelings by remarking the Bill "as the work of an old man in a hurry". The Bill, indeed, was too advanced of its times. The opposition led to its rejection in the Parliament and Gladstone resigned from Prime Ministership. The agitations and disorder increased in Ireland with the resignation of Gladstone. Salisbury the next Prime Minister brought in some land reforms but these could not satisfy the Irish sentiments. Parnell was at the height of his glory. There was, however, a scandal brought against him which ruined his career and led to his fall. He very shortly afterward sank to his grave.

With Parnell's death the Irish movement for a time got a set-back but it was again a burning question in the country with the accession of Gladstone to power for the fourth time, the **'Second Home Rule Bill'** was introduced in the Parliament by Gladstone. He was determined to scale down any type of opposition in the House of Commons. Although the majority of the members were not in the favour of the Bill but by his impressive oratory he got the majority of votes in his favour. The

Bill was then sent to the House of Lords. The Lords threw it out of the House and their opposition led to the delay of Home Rule for the next about three decades. Gladstone resigned and the Irish problem remained unsolved.

Questions.

1. Write a brief note on Anglo-Irish Relations during the 19th century.
2. Examine briefly the relation between Great Britain and Ireland since 1800.
3. What were the main grievances of the Irish after the Act of Union? To what extent and by whom have they been removed?
4. What was the "Irish Problem" after Catholic Emancipation and how far was it solved by 1878?

CHAPTER XX

CAUSES OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR

The First World War, which started in 1914 and ended in 1918, was the grèatest war known to the world upto the time. There was not one or two powers which participated in this war but it was joined by all the great powers of the world. The seeds of the war, according to some writers, had been sown during the Conference of Berlin. The underlying causes of the first world war can be noticed in the events of the past several decades. Germany, Austria, Turkey and Balgaria were on one side while England, France, Russia, Japan, America and Italy were some of the important powers on the other side. The following were some of the causes which led to the First World War.

Germany from time immemorial had been divided into several small states. The important European powers fully exploited the internal disunity of Germany. During the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries the small German States had been under the influence of the Austrians and the Spaniards. Germany had been a cradle of many European movements. It was a hot bed of sedition. Reformation had its home in Germany and its lands were a constant prey of many European rivalries. Austria and Prussia were the two important powers amongst the German States. In the beginning of the 19th century there began a Socialist movement in the whole of Germany. The despotic rulers were in the beginning successful to check its tide but later on it

developed over the whole of the country. The Kaiser of Prussia was so much troubled by this movement that he had a mind to abdicate from the throne. He was, however, prevented by a man of destiny who later on for sometime became the dictator of Europe. Bismarck as his name appeared on the scene and assured the Prussian Kaiser that the movement could be checked if he was given the authority to handle the situation. Bismarck was thus appointed the Chancellor of Prussia. He was a man of "blood and iron" policy. Just like a bully he tried to kick down every national rising within the country. He kept before the German Council the idea of a great German Empire and the unity of all the German speaking people. The idea was not, however, liked in the beginning as the rulers of several small states found their position in danger in that case. Bismarck considered Austria, another member of the German Council, a great obstacle in his path and he wanted to remove it.

While following the policy of the unification of all the German states under one flag and the unity of all the German speaking people, Bismarck wrote to the Duke of Denmark to surrender the regions of Schleswig and Holstein. He refused and this led to a joint attack of Austria and Prussia over the state of Denmark. Palmerston the British foreign minister during the period threatened Bismarck with a war in case he did not withdraw his forces from the Danish territories. Bismarck who had the support of Austria would not bother for a challenge of the sort. When Palmerston found Bismarck resolute in his attitude he remained silent and thus Schleswig and Holstein were turned over to the joint administration of Prussia and Austria.

Prussia and Austria had some differences within the German Council and this led to a war between them. Bismarck, who was a practical man and who never believed in a policy of speech-making had organised and equipped the Prussian forces to the teeth. Within the

capture of the French king led to the establishment of a republic in France with Theirs as its head. The occupation of Paris by the Germans was not at all tolerable to the sentiments of France and by the collection of big amount within a very short period the French astonished even Bismarck. They thus got their capital relieved. The capture of Alsace and Lorraine completed the work of unification of Germany, started by Bismarck. The French, however, were very much annoyed at this attitude of the Germans. They considered the taking away of Alsace and Lorraine as the snatching away of children from the mother. The people living within the two states of Alsace and Lorraine were no doubt German speaking people but it should not also be forgotten that they were French thinking people. The people of these states had progressed with the French during the last several decades. They had enjoyed the thrills of the French revolution and the ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity had so much taken root in their minds that it was not possible for them to change them back to the old ideals of despotism prevailing in Germany. As the history of the next several decades showed the French thinking people of Alsace and Lorraine were never conciled to the rule of Germany and if at all Germany continued to govern them it was by the sheer force. The French were also very estranged and in spite of several efforts of Bismarck they could never be reconciled. The remarks of the French ambassador in Germany that the German Chancellor should never bring in the matter of Alsace and Lorraine during his conversation with him as the sentiments of the French Ambassador were wounded clearly show that the French could never forget the loss of the two regions. So long as Bismarck was at the helm of affairs he kept the French in an isolated condition. He did not allow them to win over the support of any European nation and to fulfil the dream of recovery of the two states. The policy of Bismarck was not followed up by his successors. France was in a position to make friends with many of the European nations and one of the chief causes of the first world war was the rivalry of Germany and France over the question of Alsace and Lorraine.

The second cause responsible for the first world war was the rivalry between Austria and Russia over the question of the Balkans. The Balkans were being ruled by the Turkish Sultan. Balkan States comprising of different nationalities of the Bulgarians, Serbs and the Roumanians wanted their independence from the Turkish Sultan during the nineteenth century. They had been inspired by the watchwords of the French revolution and wanted to see themselves free. The Greeks, one of their nationalities, had already gained their independence and they wanted to follow suit. Russia was interested in the disintegration of the Turkish empire while Austria was in favour of its integration. That does not mean that Russia had some special sympathies with the Balkans. If the Russians wanted to see them free it was because of selfish interests. Divided Balkan would be weaker and thus Russia would be in a position to fulfil her dream—the dream of the establishment of her ascendancy in its small states. If Austria wanted the integrity of Turkey it was not due to any love for the Turkish Sultan. During all the crusade wars Austria had fought against the Turks. If today Austria wanted the integrity of Turkey it was because her own integrity was interlinked with that of Turkey. The independence of Balkans meant the independence of a part of the Austrian population which was also a kith and kin of the Balkan nationalities. Austria thus would not see eye to eye with Russia over the Balkan question. The four phases of the Eastern question saw the disintegration of the Turkish empire by slow degrees. The treaty of San Stefano sounded the death knell of the Turkish empire as it declared the independence of Serbia, Roumania, Bulgaria and Montenegro. A big Bulgaria had been created. It was resented by the other nationalities. Even Austria found in it a danger to her position. A big Bulgaria as was estimated by the European nations was to be a place of Russian exploitation and its centre of power. Thus they clamoured for the division of Bulgaria. The conference of Berlin satisfied the demands of Austria

as Bulgaria was divided but it in no way satisfied the Russians. Bismarck, the Chancellor of Germany, wanted to maintain harmony between Russia and Austria the two powers of the league of three emperors. The Balkan regions were divided into two spheres of influence. Russians were not to interfere in the sphere specified for the Austrians, and the Austrians similarly were not to interfere in the Russians zone. The harmony, however, could not be maintained for long. Later on when the Austrians instigated the Bulgarians and Roumanians against Russia the Russians retaliated in instigating the Serbians against Austria. The relations between the two nations were embittered to such an extent that they were simply on the look out for an excuse to pounce upon each other. Germany and France had already been very estranged over Alsace and Lorraine. Germany and Russia were a bit estranged over the Balkan problem and some other issues which will be taken up under a separate heading. This led to an alliance between Russia and France called the Dual Alliance and another similar alliance between Germany and Austria. Thus Europe was divided in two parts and these two armed camps precipitated the first world war.

The third cause responsible for the first world war was a struggle between Italy and France over the Tunisian question. France and Italy, the two European nations, were interested in the Tunisian regions. Bismarck, the Chancellor of Germany encouraged the French abroad so that they might forget the loss of Alsace and Lorraine. He told the French Ambassador that the Germans would be glad to help the French abroad if the French gave up the idea of gaining back the regions of Alsace and Lorraine. The French ambassador replied that the French Government was very thankful to the Germans for their co-operation but to keep the relations cordial it was better for Bismarck not to talk of the two states at any time with them. Some writers hold that encouragement to the French towards the annexation of Tunis

was to estrange them with the Italians and thus to attract them to the Germans. This, however, does not seem to be correct. Bismarck never spoke very highly of the Italians and he had never a mind to attract them. He called them fickle minded people on whose friendship nobody could rely. Actually it were the Italians who approached the Germans for friendship. If Bismarck encouraged the French for annexation with the remark, 'The Tunisian apple is ripe pluck it, otherwise some other nation might steal it.' It was more to oblige the French than to have the Italians in his fold. Encouraged by Bismarck the French annexed the regions of Tunis. It was deeply resented by the Italians who immediately joined the Dual Alliance of Germany and Austria and thus converted it into a Triple Alliance. French and Italian rivalry was later on smoothened. The French wanted to break away the Italians from the Triple Alliance so they offered the whole of Tripoli to them. The Italians were thus won over and they made a promise that they would remain neutral in the struggle. If the Italians later on joined the 1st World War they justified the remark of Bismarck—that the fickle minded people of Italy were opportunists and they joined a side where they gained something. They really supported the winning horse although the winning horse did not allow them to gain naything in the Treaty of Versailles signed in 1919 after the end of the first world war. The joining of Italy, however, strengthened the German group.

The fourth cause responsible for the 1st World war was the rise of the spirit of militarism in Germany. It estranged her with England as the latter could never tolerate a very strong nation in Europe. England even abandoned her policy of splendid isolation and came into the political arena of Europe due to the fear of the growing power of Germany. Germany had made an astonishing progress in all spheres during the last half a century. The policy of Bismarck had not only united

Germany but had also made her the supreme power of Europe. The French, Austrians and the Danes had been defeated. Russia had been befriended though later on estranged. The centre of political activities of Europe shifted from Paris to Berlin. Bismarckian era began in the history of Europe. England could not see all these developments but with a very jealous eye. So long there was Bismarck at the helm of affairs he did not give a chance to any of the European nations to embitter itself with Germany and he kept five balls at a time rolling in the air. He fished in troubled waters of Europe and while the other nations were bewildered at these problems Bismarck found them a good pastime. With his dismissal the events took quite a different turn. His successors could not keep five balls at a time rolling in the air. Too much inclination towards Austria estranged German relations with the Russians, who now drifted towards France whom Bismarck had so far kept in an isolated condition. Some of the writers hold that Bismarck had permanently alienated Russia at the conference of Berlin when the Russian foreign minister Gorchakoff left the conference in a very sullen mood. It is, however, not so. The Re-insurance treaties between Germany and Russia, maintained upto 1890, the year of Bismarck's dismissal are quite a good proof of an understanding between Russia and Germany.

Even after the dismissal of Bismarck the Russians approached the German Government for the renewal of the reinsurance treaty and it was from the German side that the proposal was rejected. Germany after this date had definitely drifted towards the side of Austria and Russia had no other alternative but to join France. Upto the days of Bismarck there had never been a step from the German Government which might estrange its relations with the English but after his dismissal the policy followed by Germany was directly against the interests of England. Germany had finished goods but she had no markets to dispose them off. Germany had

gone ahead all the nations of Europe in the race of manufacturing articles. Germany being without markets now looked for them. All the markets of the world were under the control of the English and the French. It was thus natural that if Germany was to have markets she must come into conflict with those two nations of Europe. There was a popular cry in Germany "We also like to have a place under the sun". The English and the French had also begun to realise that Germany was a great danger to their position. Thus we find that England and France, the two traditional enemies, buried their mutual disputes in all the parts of the world for making a joint front to the Germans.

England and France had been rivals in Egypt. Delcasse, the French foreign minister had in his view the recovery of Alsace and Lorraine. A conflict with England would have made these prospects very gloomy. So he was thinking of coming to terms with the English at any cost. He agreed to the British influence in Egypt in exchange for the British support to France on the question of Morocco.

In Morocco there was no doubt a Muslim Sultan but he was too weak to oppose the French influence within the state. All the nations of Europe had their trading relations with the Sultan of Morocco. The states of France and Spain were however more interested in the Morocco regions. After a settlement between England and France, the French people came to a settlement with the Spaniards. The Spaniards were promised some regions of Northern Morocco. Germany remained silent in the matter. When the French tried to capture some posts within the regions of Morocco the German Government immediately despatched its warship Panther with the outward declaration that it was for the safeguard of the German counsel within the state but in reality for gaining some concessions for the Germans from the French as had been gained by the English and the Spaniards. The

malafide intentions of Germany were beforehand known to France when the German Kaiser in his speech in Morocco had assured its Sultan that the latter could count upon the help of the former. The presence of Panther, a war boat of Germany at Agadir was a constant danger to the English who had similarly their position at Gibraltar a bit away from Agadir. This resulted in Morocco crisis. Hot words were exchanged between the nations especially England and Germany and although Germany was in a position to gain some regions from France in the territories of Congo yet she alienated her relations with the English who now still more drifted to the side of France.

The English were also estranged with Germany over the latter's policy towards the naval affairs. Germany had realized that England by friendly relations was not at all ready to give any concession to the merchants within her colonies and other possessions. Germany had demonstrated her supremacy over the other nations of Europe on land by winning victories over the Danes, Austrians and the French. Germany now lacked nothing but a fleet. The policy for building a fleet had actually been inserted in the German programme of 1897. If Germany was not to be supreme in naval power it should atleast hold a position of honour among other nations so far as its naval power was concerned. 'Risky navy' was the word used by the German admiral in his programme which the Germans were to have. When the 'future of the Germans lay on the waters' they must have 'Risky Navy'. England was not bewildered. England did not like to have any rivalry with Germany and when the German programme was known in England the latter by many ways tried to stop the Germans from that programme. For the Germans navy was but a luxury. For the English, however, it was a necessity, their country being an island surrounded from all its sides by water. Haldane missions and two other such missions were sent one after another but all of them failed. The Kaiser of Germany was not going

to talk for a settlement if there was the insertion of a clause for the limitation of German navy. England no doubt competed in the race of supremacy but it was at a very heavy cost.

In Germany the cost of building dreadnoughts and other such warships in comparison to England was very low. Secondly England was also to keep comparatively a superior naval force. The next few years upto the outbreak of war are nothing but a long story of the English attempts for the limitation of German naval power. When England failed in her attempts it made some definite commitments with the people of France as far as there was the concern of the British defence of its colonies, possession and its own islands. To say that England joined the war simply because Germany marched through Belgium and broke its neutrality, is something not based upon facts.

Realising the French and the English as their future rivals the Germans made an attempt to win over the small states of Balkans and they were partly successful. Bulgaria and Roumania joined them. Roumania, however, later on deserted the German group and went over the side of the British group. Turkey also joined Germany. The Germans took up the work of the Baghdad Railway. The French and their allies boycotted the German scheme and in every possible way tried to obstruct them. Thus Germany was now encircled by all the powers of Europe on all sides. Austria was her only respectable supporter. Italy being a country of opportunists.

England owing to her traditional enmity with the French and rivalry with Russia on the Eastern Question and Asia had tried to join the German group in the beginning. She was, however, prevented, because of her divergent interests with Germany over colonial and commercial question. She thus for some time had maintained a policy of splendid isolation. She was, however, compelled

to abandon it, as it was no more a splendid policy. She was placed in a very awkward position in the European regions when she had to face complications in South Africa and Egypt. She had no friend but on all sides there were rivals. She thus now had her leanings towards the policy of alliance but neither of the two groups she could join. She thus concluded an alliance with Japan in 1902 popularly known as Anglo Japanese Alliance. In the alliance, some of the British politicians found a master stroke of policy but there were some who criticised it. It was mainly an alliance against Russia of which both the countries were enemies. The critics found in the alliance an unnecessary complication and even entanglement with Russia at a time. England might or might not come into conflict with the Russians but Japan was surely to be arrayed very soon according to these critics. That came out to be true. England and France the two newly befriended nations of Europe were in a very awkward position. France was a friend of Russia while England of Japan. The two nations, however, prevented it from becoming a world wide struggle and they localized it by remaining neutral. Russia was defeated quite unexpectedly. Now there was a chance for German Kaiser William II to fish in troubled waters. He met the Russian Czar at Bajorko and made him realize that friendship of France was of no advantage to him. Kaiser, however, could not break him from the French, partly because of the opposition of his chancellor Bulow and partly due to the opposition of the Russian Government to the settlement which had already been arrived at between the two great rulers of the Eastern Europe. By the intercession of England and France Russia and Japan came to terms in 1905 and thus all these nations were now planning a programme for the humiliation of Germany.

The Balkan wars of 1912 further complicated the problem and in 1913 the whole of the world leaving a few neutral countries was split into two camps, one led by Germany, the other by France and England. The

following were the nations now directly inter-connected with the two camps and which took part in the 1st world war:

Germany, Austria, Bulgaria, Turkey were the chief powers in 'one group. Italy although committed to Germany remained neutral, not only neutral but even it joined the opposition in the later stages. France, England, Japan, Russia, Serbia, Roumania and Greece were the members of the opposite 'camp. The United states of America later on joined them because of the destructive policy of Germany towards the trading ships on the waters.

Both the sides had armed themselves to their teeth. There was only the need of a spark which might ablaze the whole of that Gunpowder of Hatred which they had stored in their hearts for the last several decades when there came the last crisis.

Austria and Russia were great rivals in the Balkan regions. There was, however, a revolutionary change noticed in their relations. Izvolsky and Aerenthal, the foreign ministers of Russia and Austria met in a conference. It was decided that Austria might annex the regions of Bosnia and Herzegovina which were under its administration since the conference of Berlin. The Russians in lieu of this acknowledgement of Austrian claims were to have the support of Austria in the Black Sea Question.

After this settlement with the Austrians, Izvolsky, the foreign minister of Russia started for Paris to get a similar type of acknowledgement from the English and the French. Aerenthal, the Austrian foreign minister, declared the annexation of the two principalities as soon as Izvolsky left for France. At Paris the first news in the paper which greeted Izvolsky was annexation of

Bosinia and Herzegovina by the Austrians. It was further stated that Izvolsky the foreign minister of Russia had given his consent in the matter. Izvolsky was bewildered. He consulted the French and the English Governments in the matter and asked for their consent in the acknowledgement of Russian claim on the Black Sea regions. England, however, would not agree. Izvolsky thus could not gain anything. The acknowledgement of Austrian claim on Bosinia and Herzegovina was quite against the policy of Russian Government. Russia had always taken up the cause of Serbia in the matter of Bosinia and Herzegovina. It was betrayal on the part of Russia.

Serbia raised a great hue and cry against the Austrian policy of annexation and even began to move her forces towards the borders of Austria. There was an instigation from the Russian Government as well. Germany at this stage by a bold policy cooled the whole of the agitation of the Serbians when it declared its stand for its friend Austria even in the case of a war. Turkey also gave her consent. Serbia was thus compelled to acknowledge the claim of Austria on the two principalities of Bosinia and Herzegovina. Germany, however, at this stage committed a blunder. Its Kaiser's open assertion that "We stood by our ally in shining armour" was too provocative a remark to be pocketed by the opposite side. After this diplomatic defeat France and Russia made up their minds to accept a challenge of Germany at all cost if made again after the date. The Russians and French now were day and night busy in the organisation of their forces. When they became confident of their success in case of a struggle with the powers of the Triple Alliance they asked the Serbians to create a trouble.

In the meanwhile agitations in Bosinia and Herzegovina for their separation from the Austrian Government were at their climax. Many royal officers were shot down

dead by the terrorist. It was under these circumstances that Prince Archduke of Austria toured the affected regions to assure his people of an internal autonomy after a short period and a benevolent government. Unfortunately he could not complete his journey. When he reached the city of Sarajevo at the very time some Serbians with the idea of murdering him crossed their border into Sarajevo. The 1st attempt of blowing him up by a bomb failed and the prince, behaving as if nothing at all had happened, addressed the people of the city in their Municipal Hall. When he wanted to leave the hall in a state procession he was requested not to go in that state as there was every danger of another such attempt on his life. He, however, would not listen. His last time, indeed, had come and all the warnings fell on deaf ears. While his car was taking a turn he was attacked and shot through his brain. He fell down senseless and after a while breathed his last. The city of Sarajevo which was rejoicing a few hours ago was now in mourning state. When the Austrian Government learnt of the escape of murderers to Serbia she wrote to Serbian Government to surrender the murderers. Serbia, instigated by Russia however, would not listen. After this date as is clear from the European political affairs Austria and Germany made every attempt to make some peaceful settlement but the opposite party obstructed all its prospects and hastened the 1st world war. Russia mobilized her forces towards the borders of Germany but then withdrew. Germany realising that a general war in case of Serbo-Austrian war was sure made all arrangements for it. Austria sent an ultimatum to the Serbians and after the expiry and refusal of Serbia to accept the proposal declared a war. Russia joined Serbia and moved its forces towards the Austro-German borders. Germany sent an ultimatum to Russia asking not to join against Austria and at her refusal declared a war. France as per clauses of the Dual Alliance joined Russia. England joined the war when Germany little caring for the guarantee, already given to Belgium, passed her forces through that country to

make an attack on Northern France. Bulgaria and Turkey joined the powers of Triple alliance while Greece, Montenegro and Roumania joined the French and the English group. Thus the whole of Europe was in the grip of a war, never so far known in the History of the World.

Questions

1. Give the causes of the First World War (1914-18). Was it inevitable ?
2. Explain how and why did Great Britain abandon the so-called policy of splendid Isolation.
3. Show how England became involved in the diplomacy which resulted in the Great War of 1914.
4. The Great War was more than an international conflict ; it was a revolution. Explain.

B. A. HISTORY PAPERS

1952

Q. 1. Explain how George III tried to establish a personal rule ; and show what effects it had on the British Empire.

Q. 2. What contemporary and what subsequent effect did the French Revolution have upon Great Britain ?

Q. 3. Why was Napoleon beaten ?

Q. 4. "The accession of Canning to the Foreign Office was an event of real significance alike for England and Europe." Discuss.

Q. 5. What defects in the system of parliamentary representation was the Reform Bill (1832) intended to remedy ? In what ways was it not a final settlement ?

Q. 6. How and why did Great Britain become a Free Trade country in the nineteenth century ?

Q. 7. What were the causes of the Crimean War ? Why did the British soldiers suffer at the beginning of this war ?

Or, Consider how far Disraeli was justified in claiming to have brought back "Peace with honour" from Berlin.

Q. 8. Explain the importance of the Durham Report and the principal changes in the policy of the Home Government towards the colonies since its publication.

Q. 9. Summarise the principal achievements of Gladstone's home policy.

Q. 10. What was the "Irish Problem" after Catholic Emancipation, and how far was it solved by 1878 ?

Q. 11. In what dangers was Great Britain involved at the end of Victoria's reign by her isolation from continental affairs ?

Q. 12. Show how Great Britain became involved in the diplomacy which resulted in the World War ?

1953.

Q. 1. Explain how George III tried to establish a personal rule and show what effects it had on the British Empire.

Q. 2. Discuss the evils existing in the pre-reform electoral system and show how far they were removed by the Reform Acts of 1832 and 1867.

Q. 3. Discuss the causes and effects of the War of American Independence.

Q. 4. Why was Napoleon beaten ?

Q. 5. How did the Industrial Revolution affect the social and political life of the English in the nineteenth century ?

Q. 6. Lord Palmerston's death 'closed an epoch and left the door open to Gladstonian radicalism'. Elucidate.

Q. 7. Discuss the policy of Disraeli towards Turkey and give the arguments of Gladstone's opposition.

Q. 8. Explain and illustrate, by means of concrete examples, the policy of the Liberal and Conservative parties respectively in Great Britain during the nineteenth century.

Q. 9. What were the main grievances of the Irish after the Act of Union? To what extent and by whom have they been removed?

Q. 10. Show how Great Britain became involved in the diplomacy which resulted in the World War.

Q. 11. Discuss the chief humanitarian measures carried out in England during the first half of the nineteenth century.

Q. 12. What appear to you to have been the main defects of the peace settlement of 1919?

Or,

Show that the Treaty of Versailles resulted in the Balkanization of Europe. Was it possible to avoid it?

1953—(Sept)

Q. 1. 'George, be a king'. How did George III succeed in his attempt to rule as well as to reign?

Q. 2. What contemporary and what subsequent effect did the French Revolution have upon Great Britain?

Q. 3. For England the decade after Waterloo was of 'peace without plenty'. Discuss.

Q. 4. 'The accession of Canning to the Foreign Office was an event of real significance alike for England and for Europe' Discuss.

Q. 5. How and why did Great Britain become a Free Trade country in the nineteenth century?

Q. 6. Explain the importance of the Durham Report and the principal changes in the policy of the Home Government towards the colonies since its publication.

Q. 7. What claim has Gladstone to the gratitude of Englishman?

Q. 8. Consider whether the reign of Queen Victoria can rightly be called 'A Great Age'.

Q. 9. Examine briefly the relation between Great Britain and Ireland since 1800.

Q. 10. Discuss the causes of the Boer War, and point out its consequences on the future developments of South Africa.

Q. 11. What were the chief objects for which England took part in the World War I? How far were they realized?

Q. 12. Stress the importance of the League of Nations in European history, and account for its failure to preserve world peace.

Or,

"The application of the principle of nationality in the twentieth century, unlike that in the nineteenth, proved to be less of a creative and more of a destructive force." Discuss this with reference to the peace settlement of 1919.

Q. 13. Give a brief account of any *three* of the following :—

- | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. Continental system. | 3. Treaty of Berlin (1878). |
| 2. Anti-Corn-law league. | 4. Anglo-German Rivalry. |

1954—April

Q. 1. Why did George III oust the Whigs from power? What methods did he adopt to achieve this end.

Q. 2. What was the 'Old Colonial System'? How did it come to an end?

Q. 3. What contemporary and what subsequent effect did the French Revolution have upon Great Britain?

Q. 4. Show systematically and in detail how the British Government and people contributed to the destruction of the military dictatorship of Europe by Napoleon.

Q. 5. What do you understand by the term 'The Agrarian Revolution'? What effect did it have on the social and economic life of England?

Q. 6. How and why did Great Britain become a free trade country in the nineteenth century?

Q. 7. 'If ever a war was made by an ill judged but ardent public opinion against the better judgment of a divided government, it was the Crimean War.' Discuss.

Q. 8. Describe the stages by which Great Britain became a political democracy from 1832.

Q. 9. Illustrate Disraeli's record as party leader and as a foreign minister.

Q. 10. How and why did Great Britain abandon the so-called policy of 'Splendid Isolation'?

Q. 11. Discuss the terms of Peace Settlement of 1919, noting those which especially affected Great Britain.

Q. 12. Was the Second World War inevitable?

M. A. HISTORY PAPERS

1948

Q. 1. It is questionable whether George III understood or wished to understand the great men and the causes for which they stood for which the sovereign was more responsible than any one else. Critically examine this statement.

Q. 2. Briefly narrate the events which estranged the colonies and led to the American declaration of Independence.

Q. 3. Pitt's genius extricated the monarchy from a debauchee and made its cause intelligible and attractive to the average men. His principles and objects involved the final defeat of Whiggism. Comment.

Q. 4. Briefly describe the features and principles of settlement of the Congress of Vienna. What part did British Diplomacy play in the settlement?

Q. 5. Briefly describe the social and financial reforms introduced in England during the year 1822-30.

Q. 6. Give a brief account of the Irish Policy of the Whig Government during 1833-37.

Q. 7. Briefly state the causes of the Crimean War, why did England join it and what did she achieve by it?

Q. 8. Write a note on the British foreign policy in the Palmerston era.

Q. 9. The judgement of events would seem to have decided that on the Turkish Problems at any rate Gladstone was right and Beaconsfield wrong.

Q. 10. Give a brief account of the work of administrators in Egypt and London in the latter half of 19th century.

Q. 11. In the course of these anxious years (1895-1905) the British Commonwealth was forced to abandon that political isolation on which it prided itself as it was attended by grave danger.

Q. 12. What were the problems with which the conference of Paris was faced. What momentous decision did it take?

1949

Q. 1. "His (George I) fine strength of character and great political ability unenlightened by large understanding or by generous sympathy with his people degenerated into the low and cunning wire-puller and the obstinacy that wrecks the empire". Comment.

Q. 2. Describe Pitts' contribution towards the establishment and regulation of the British Power in the East.

Q. 3. Discuss the Causes and Results of the American War of Independence.

Q. 4. Illustrate the importance of the British Naval Power in the struggle with Napoleon.

Q. 5. "Palmerston" raised the prestige of England to the height which she had not occupied since Waterloo". Comment.

Q. 6. Give an account of the system of Parliamentary representation, during the early 19th century and explain the changes made by the First Reform Act.

Q. 7. Give an account of the movement of the Irish Home Rule since 1848.

Q. 8. Describe the growth of Labour movement in England during the 19th century.

Q. 9. What is meant by the phrase, "The Industrial Revolution in Britain". Explain the changes which it brought in the country.

Q. 10. Describe the events leading to the treaty of Sanstefano and write a critical note on its provisions.

Q. 11. Briefly examine the achievements of the liberal Government in England from 1905-15 in the field of social Reforms.

Q. 12. Why did Great Britain go to war against Germany in 1914.

1950—April

Q. 1. Account for George III's failure to Play the part of a 'Patriot King'.

Q. 2. Discuss the influence of the industrial revolution on English social and political life.

Q. 3. "The French Revolution made Pitt a Tory". Discuss.

Q. 4. Discuss the causes of economic distress and political discontent between 1815-1830.

Q. 5. Examine the constitutional significance of the career of John Wilkes.

Q. 6. "In foreign politics Palmerston was atonce a Radical and a Jingo", (Trevelyn). Examine the work of Palmerston under the two heads above.

Q. 7. Trace the influence of Bentham and John Stuart Mill on Policy and legislation in the nineteenth century.

Q. 8. "It is to credit of Gladstone and the discredit of Disraeli that the one saw, and the other missed, what in course of history was to prove the solution." (Ensor). Examine the policy of Disraeli towards the Eastern Question in the light of the above remark.

Q. 9. "The last decade of the nineteenth century witnessed nothing less than a revolution in regard to the Overseas Empire." Discuss.

Q. 10. Discuss the background and the constitutional importance of the Parliament Act of 1911.

Q. 11. Write notes on any *two* of the following :—

- (1) The Methodist Movement.
- (2) The Young England Movement.
- (3) The Fabians.
- (4) Robert Owen.
- (5) Army reform in the 19th Century.
- (6) Education Act (1870).

1950—Sept.

Q. 1. "A First Rate Party Politician" is a verdict on George III justified by the history of the years 1760-82. Discuss.

Q. 2. Is it correct to say that the war of American Independence was directly due to the Seven Years War.

Q. 3. Discuss the reaction of the French Revolution on English Political thought as represented by Burke and Paine.

Q. 4. Peel was a good administrator but an indifferent statesman. Discuss.

Q. 5. Estimate the influence of Whigs force and Shaftesbury on social legislation in England.

Q. 6. Do you think that Palmerston can be rightly described as a political heir of Canning.

Q. 7. What were the main features of Durham Report. How did it influence the future Colonial policy of England.

Q. 8. Examine the nature and changes brought about by the Reform Acts of 1867 and 1884.

Q. 9. Give your estimate of Parnell as a national leader and critically assess his contribution to the Irish Home Rule movement.

Q. 10. Compare the record of Gladstone and Disraeli as party leaders.

Q. 11. Discuss the background of constitutional crisis in 1910 and comment on the Parliament Act of 1911.

Q. 12. Discuss the growth of Trade Unionism in England.

1951—April

Q. 1. "The American Revolution is, an event unique at once in its causes, its character and its consequences." Explain.

Q. 2. Pitt (the Younger) has been described as good peace minister but "Unequal to terrible emergencies" Examine this.

Q. 3. "At Waterloo England fought for victory, at Trafalgar for existence" (Mahan) Explain and examine this statement.

Q. 4. Estimate the influence of either Adam Smith's or of Robert Owen on contemporary thought and actions.

Q. 5. Account for and trace the growth of the Free Trade Movement in Britain and assess the contribution to it of Sir Robert Peel.

Q. 6. "The Industrial evolution has left the labourer a land-less stranger in his own country, the political evolution is rapidly making him its ruler. (Sydney Webb) Explain.

Q. 7. State the Irish problem of the nineteenth century and assess the success of Gladstone in solving this problem.

Q. 8. Expound the political programme of the New Conservatism and illustrate it with reference to Disraeli's administration of 1874-80.

Q. 9. Examine the foreign policy of Sir Edward Gray, discussing particularly those aspects which have been adversely criticised.

Q. 10. Write short notes on any two of the following :—

(1) Whig Oligarchy, (2) Continental System, (3) Sybil, (4) Joseph Chamberlain, (5) Taff Vale Judgment.

1951—Sept.

Q. 1. "The dispute on both sides was an affair of sordid interest." "It was a question of liberty or authority government by consent or government by force." Which of these two views describes the American Revolution more correctly?

Q. 2. Explain the need of Dunning's resolution of 1780, "The power of the Crown has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished."

Q. 3. Describe briefly the course of Agricultural Revolution in Britain and estimate its political importance.

Q. 4. Contrast the attempts of George III and Queen Victoria to assert the personal influence of the sovereign.

Q. 5. Explain Younger Pitt's domestic policy before the French Revolution. Account for and trace subsequent change in this policy.

Q. 6. Compare the foreign policy of Canning and Palmerston.

Q. 7. Disraeli has been accused of political opportunism. How well is this charge borne out by his Second Reform Bill.

Q. 8. Compare the attitude of Gladstone and Salisbury towards the Eastern Question.

Q. 9. Explain the chief causes of the growing hostility between Britain and Germany during 1890-1914.

Q. 10. Write short notes on any two of the following :—

1. Jeremy Bentham.
2. Catholic Emancipation.
3. Durham Report.
4. Fashoda Incident.
5. Parliament Act of 1911.

1952—April

Q. 1. "Pitt did not make the Empire but he saved it in the hours of a great peril". Discuss this statement.

Q. 2. Explain the need for Dunning's resolution of 1780, "The power of the crown has increased, is increasing and ought to be diminished."

Q. 3. "The dispute on both sides was an affair of sordid interest." How far is this a correct description of the American Revolution.

Q. 4. "The French Revolution made Pitt a Tory" Explain and examine this statement.

Q. 5. "British colonial policy was fundamentally changed during the 20 years following 1830." Elucidate and discuss.

Q. 6. How far is it true to say that Peel was the burglar of other people's ideas? Give an estimate of Peel as a Conservative leader.

Q. 7. How far did the Chartist Movement effect British legislation in the second half of the 19th century?

Q. 8. Compare the attitude of Disraeli and Gladstone towards the Eastern question.

Q. 9. Trace the bearing of Egypt on the relations between British and other Great Powers.

Q. 10. Sketch the rise and significance of the Labour Party in English politics.

Q. 11. Discuss the causes which led to the Anglo-Russian Entente in 1907.

1952—Sept.

Q. 1. Account for the progressive weakness of the Whig Party after 1760.

Q. 2. Compare Chatham and Younger Pitt as war ministers.

Q. 3. Trace the bearing of the French Revolution on the Irish Problem at the close of the 18th Century.

Q. 4. Trace the growth of the Free Trade movement in Britain with special reference to the contributions to it of Huskisson or Gladstone.

Q. 5. "I have brought the New World into existence to redress the balance of the Old." (Canning). Explain the occasion and the propriety of this statement.

Q. 6. Trace the bearing of the Industrial Revolution on the 'Condition of England' Problem and on the growth of the British Empire during the 19th Century.

Q. 7. Disraeli has been accused of political opportunism. How far do you agree with this verdict?

Q. 8. Write a note on the Near Eastern Policy of either Palmerston or of Gladstone.

Q. 9. Outline briefly and discuss the relation between Britain and France during 1870-1904.

Q. 10. Discuss the causes responsible for the passage of the Parliament of Act 1911 and assess its constitutional importance.

Q. 11. Discuss the influence on contemporary thought and action of Jeremy Bentham or of Joseph Chamberlain.

1953—April

Q. 1. "Pitt (the Elder) declared that he would conquer America in Germany". Elucidate this statement.

Q. 2. Trace the influence of either Jeremy Bentham or of Joseph Chamberlain on contemporary thought and action.

Q. 3. Estimate the influence of the French Revolution on England. How did England avoid a violent revolution.

Q. 4. Naval Supremacy and Balance of Power represented British reaction to Revolutionary and Napoleonic France. Explain.

Q. 5. State and examine the arguments advanced for and against the Reform Bill of 1832.

Q. 6. "Behind the Corn Laws indeed, Protection found its last shelter". Why and with what results were the Corn Laws repealed?

Q. 7. Explain the growth of Trade-Unionism into Labour-Movement and point out the main stages in this transformation.

Q. 8. Expound the programme of New Toryism and illustrate it with reference to any one of Disraeli's administrations.

Q. 9. Account for and assess the importance of the Anglo-Japanese Treaty of 1902.

Q. 10. Write a note on Anglo-Egyptian relations during your period of study.

1953—Sept.

Q. 1. Compare the attitude of Chatham, Burke and North towards the American Revolution.

Q. 2. "Misguided and reactionary". Is this a fair description of the domestic policy of Pitt after 1793?

Q. 3. What degree of continuity do you find in the foreign policies of Canning and Palmerston?

Q. 4. "Educate your masters". How did popular education keep pace with the advance of democracy after

Q. 5. "A leap in the dark". How far is this a correct estimate of the Reform Bill of 1867?

Q. 6. How far was Queen Victoria a constitutional monarch?

Q. 7. Account for the failure of British statesmen to conciliate Ireland during the 19th century.

Q. 8. What part did Britain play in the 'scramble for Africa' during the 19th century?

Q. 9. State and account for the radical change in the foreign policy of Britain during 1898—1907.

Q. 10. Write critical notes on any three of the following:—

Continental System, Durham Report. Lord Cromer, Imperial Preference, Haldane Mission.